The Catholic Historical Review

Volume XXXIII JANUARY, 1948 No. 4

CHATEAUBRIAND AS AN HISTORICAL WRITER*

By

FRIEDRICH ENGEL-JANOSI

To appreciate Chateaubriand's contribution to the field of French historical writing and thinking we must understand its backgrounds. Therefore, we shall review, however, briefly, French historiography during the generations preceding the advent of the author of the *Génie du christianisme*.

We shall begin with Bossuet's famous *Discours sur l'histoire universelle*, written for the instruction of the Dauphin about 1679. Our concern here is with historiographical questions, but even from this external aspect the *Discours* is remarkable for our topic.

It represents truly universal history. *La suite*, the succession of the great empires, is the subject of its politico-historical part. The bishop wants to present to his pupil *l'enchaînement des grandes affaires du monde*,[1] the interlinking of great historical events. With these words a thesis is laid down on which universal history rests at all times, the concept of continuity, of the value of tradition. This continuity is to Bossuet the result of Divine Providence permeating human history. In the Enlightenment, historians, such as Turgot and, especially, Condorcet, it will be understood according to the secularized version of progress. It will ring again with a religious connotation in Ranke.

The concept of the interlinking, of the "enchaînement," is basic to

* Presidential address delivered at the Twenty-Eighth Annual Meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association, Cleveland, Ohio, December 27, 1947. Mr. Engel-Janosi is professor of modern European history in the Catholic University of America.

[1] Bruxelles ed. (1852) II, 166.

the historical approach of the French bishop. It is that linking which makes possible historical observation and inquiry, because, as a famous sentence of the *Discours* reads,[2] "With the exception of certain great and extraordinary turns where God wanted His hand alone to be perceived, there can be no great change in history that did not have its cause in the preceding centuries."

Already, at the end of the seventeenth century, Bossuet set as the object of genuine historical writing the study of inclinations and of *moeurs,* "in a word, the study of the character of nations as well as of their rulers." He anticipated thereby much of what was to be hailed two generations later as the historical discoveries of Montesquieu and Voltaire.[3]

In the historical thought of Bossuet there appears also an idea that was to be continued and emphasized at the end of the next century, although it was contrary to the historical approach of the Enlightenment, the idea that men do not actually foresee what the result of their work and striving will be. Almost unconsciously, without knowing the outcome, they make their contributions to history: *Sans y penser* the Romans became instruments of the Divine Wrath the Jews had called forth.[4] Men achieve in history more or less than they actually planned. Their acting always brings some unexpected consequences.[5] "There is no power on earth that does not serve for other ends than those it planned."[6] A main task of the historian is, therefore, to watch carefully for the hidden dispositions which prepare great changes.[7] To the historical writer of all times the difficulties of the problem of unforeseen results have been well known. Eighteenth century historiography attempted to minimize these difficulties by ascribing historical events to the con-

[2] *Ibid.,* II, 165.

[3] According to Bossuet, the duty of the historian is to observe "les inclinations et les moeurs, ou pour tout dire en un mot, le caractère, tant des peuples dominants en général que des princes en particulier" *Ibid.,* II, 166; cf. the title of Voltaire's *Essai sur les moeurs et l'esprit des nations.*

[4] *Ibid.,* II, 158.

[5] *Ibid.,* II, 275.

[6] *Ibid,* II, 276.

[7] *Ibid.,* II, 165.

scious planning of individuals. The change came, approximately, with Burke, who perceived in history the prevalence of a slow, unconscious growth conceived in analogy to the processes of vegetable nature. A generation later this problem was to lead Hegel into such an extravagant concept as that of the cunning of the world spirit. To Bossuet no difficulty presented itself. He knew and was confident of the dependence of history on Divine Providence.

The bishop, on the other hand, did not tire of stressing the importance of human prevision and anticipation in history nor of objecting to the importance ascribed to hazard, to fortune, by such historians as Polybius, Comines, and Machiavelli. To foresee more carefully and to stick harder to one's task compel fortune to serve a man's work, Bossuet thought.[8] This capacity provided, according to him, a main test for the great man in history, like Alexander, Caesar, Charlemagne, and Louis XIV. It is on this score that enthusiastic praise is given to the senate of ancient Rome.

The third part of the *Discours,* devoted to the discussion of the empires, centers on the political value in history in a way suggestive of the treatment given to the *virtus regitiva* by St. Thomas Aquinas: "Magis igitur praemium debetur regi pro bono regimine quam subdito pro bona actione."[9] One is tempted to say that the very selection of the empires discussed was made by Bossuet from this point of view. Thus he starts with the Egyptians, "who were the first to know the rules of government,"[10] and proceeds to the Persians and the Greeks. "What was greatest in Greece was the firm and foreseeing policy that understood how to abandon, to risk, and to defend the necessary."[11] Greek philosophy and poetry are dealt with in their expression of and contribution to political thought. The climax of this trend is reached with the discussion of the Romans, "the proudest and boldest of all peoples, but at the same time the most methodical in its deliberations, the most constant in its maxims, the most circumspect, the hardest working and the most patient; we must therefore study

[8] *Ibid.,* II, 167.

[9] *De Regimine,* I, 9.

[10] *Discours,* II, 170.

[11] *Ibid.,* II, 207.

it more closely than any other."[12] It becomes evident that Bossuet is influenced in his study of the Romans by Polybius, with whom he shares a passionate search for and understanding of the problems of government. That absorption, however, remains, with the French thinker, always in harmony with the vision of and trust in divine leadership in history. "It is only due to our inability to grasp the whole that we perceive hazard or irregularity in the particular circumstances."[13]

The intellectual atmosphere was thoroughly changed by the next step in the writing, or rather in the draft for the writing, of universal history when the Abbé Turgot presented his *Tableau philosophique des progrès successifs de l'esprit humain* at the Sorbonne in December 1750. It is known that it met with considerable success at the time it was delivered.[14] We notice already the change of topic. Neither religious nor political history is the subject matter, but intellectual development, the history of the *progrès successifs de l'esprit humain*. Turgot assumed that progress underlay human history, but it was certainly progress of a very specific type.

Turgot starts by contrasting the aspect that nature offers, with its regularly repeated cycles, *tout renaît, tout périt,* to that of men, with whom each century presents an always changing view.[15] Nevertheless the pattern that human history presents is held together, is linked together. It is as if the human species itself formed one large individual slowly growing up from infancy. It is characteristic of the Enlightenment attitude to perceive mankind, if it is compared with the life of any single individual, as being still in its early stage and to

[12] *Ibid.*, II, 221 ff.

[13] *Ibid.*, II, 275.

[14] References are made to Turgot, *Oeuvres*, edited by G. Schelle (Paris, 1913), Volume I.—The following writings of Turgot afford the basis for the present analysis: a) "Tableau philosophique des progrès successifs de l'esprit humain" (1750); b) "Recherches sur les causes des progrès et de la decadence des sciences et des arts ou réflexions sur l'histoire des progrès de l'esprit humain" (Fragments, 1748); c) "Plan d'un ouvrage sur la géographie politique" (1751), and d) "Plan de deux discours sur l'histoire universelle" (c. 1751). All these writings belong to the earliest period of Turgot's life as a writer.

[15] *Ibid.*, "Tableau" pp. 214 ff.

be far from being subject even to the possibility of decay. There is in the Enlightenment no reminiscence of the Augustinian concept of the *Saeculum senescens.*

> We see the establishment of societies, the formation of nations that alternately rule and obey other nations; empires rise and fall . . . arts and sciences alternately grow and improve and alternately their progress is slowed down or accelerated. . . . Interest, ambition and vain glory change the human stage at every moment, flood the earth with blood; and in the midst of their ravages the manners soften, the human mind grows brighter; isolated nations approach each other, commerce and policy unite the different parts of the globe, and through the alternatives of calm and agitation, of good and evil, the *masse totale* of mankind marches steadily though slowly towards perfection.[16] That is what history is like in the eyes of a philosopher.[17] Like the tempests which have agitated the waves of the sea, so the evils inseparable from the revolutions disappear. The good remains and humanity grows toward perfection.[18]

This is the main trend in history as perceived by Turgot. The thought of the young abbé is attractive to the student of history precisely because it lacks rigid consistency, but rather involves many aspects which were fully elaborated only three or four generations later.

At first view it seems that equal progress would rule also in that sphere of history to which Turgot limits his inquiry, the advances of the human mind. "The same senses," says Turgot, in harmony with his age, "the same organs, the aspects of the same universe, have everywhere produced the same ideas with men, just as the same needs and the same inclinations have always brought forth the same arts." He knows that also in history "all is linked together, all the ages are chained together by a succession of causes and effects that connects the present state to all those that preceded."[19] Yet an intrinsic inequality exists between nations. It is due to nature, which does not distribute its gifts at all equally, and to the infinite variety of actual concrete circumstances. Nevertheless, one may say that

[16] *Ibid.*, pp. 215 ff; similar "Plan de deux discours" pp. 276 ff., 285.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 218.

[18] *Ibid.*

[19] *Ibid.*, pp. 214 ff.

nature in assigning genius to but a few men has distributed it over the *masse totale* at somewhat the same intervals. This genius steadily works and its effects grow perceptible as time passes.[20] Thus the mind of the *masse totale,* under the guidance of the few outstanding men, develops and, passing in the world of the natural sciences through three subsequent stages—to be known later as the "law of the three stages" of Comte, presents the varied picture of history. This development leads "to the blessed stage of Plato and Aristotle." It brings about the innumerable discoveries that were made during "the ages of barbarism." Then with the approach of the age of the Renaissance, after progress has worked slowly for centuries, "les temps sont arrivés." "The time has come; awake, Europe, from the night which has covered thee. Immortal names of the Medicis, of Leo X, of Francis I, be blessed forever . . . Salute to thee, Italy, for the second time fatherland of letters and taste." But there is no standstill. An even more important age is to appear: "Century of Louis XIV, century of great men, century of reason, speed!" Now all the shadows have disappeared. With Newton, the key to the universe is found and in Leibnitz a rival has been born even to him. "Age of Louis the Great, may your light embellish the precious age of your successor . . . may it spread over the universe. May men be able always to proceed in the path of truth; or even better, may they constantly become better and happier." These are the final words of Turgot's *Tableau.*

However, in the *Plan of Two Discourses on Universal History,* Turgot explicitly acknowledges that in the early periods of history, before reason could be developed, mankind was led by passions, and that this way was more successful than reason would have been. "Tumultuous, dangerous passions have become a principle of action and therefore of progress . . . They were necessary to the defense of individuals and peoples." And Turgot then parallels the development of history to the growth of vegetable life in the virgin forests of America.

[20] *Ibid.,* p. 218. Cf. "Plan du second discours" p. 302, 315 ff.; but also p. 303: "Aussi (les progrès) ont-ils été fort différents chez les différents peuples."—The second "mappemonde politique" should have dealt with the inequality of the advances. "Plan d'un ouvrage sur la géographie politique", *Ibid.,* p. 260.—In the "Recherches" Turgot speaks of the "hazard du génie", pp. 117, 122, 139.

In the forests of America, as ancient as the world, oaks have succeeded each other through centuries, falling into dust and thus enriching the soil with the substances that air and rain have furnished them; their remains become to the earth a new source of fecundity from which new and more vigorous shoots rise. In a similar way all over the earth governments have succeeded governments, empires have grown from the ruins of empires . . . and in this way, through the alternations of agitation and calm, of good and evil, *the masse totale* of mankind has marched steadily towards its perfection.[21]

Thus Turgot, filled with the vision of the steady progress of the *masse totale*, cares as little for those who succumbed as for the oaks that have fallen in the American forests. With a typical Enlightenment attitude, it is assumed by him that those who were not successful, who did not survive, were rightly destined to doom and entitled to not more than to serve as fertilizers for the growth of more vigorous shoots.[22]

"That is what history is like in the eyes of a philosopher," Turgot had written, and from an analogous angle, *en philosophe*, Voltaire, apparently the author of the somewhat disputable expression, "philosophy of history,"[23] wanted to look at history. "You wish to read history *en philosophe*," he wrote to the Marquise de Châtelet-Lorraine, to whom he dedicated his *Essai sur les moeurs et l'esprit des nations*. "You look only for useful truths and you have found, as you tell me, only useless errors. . . . You look in the midst of that immensity of modern history only for what deserves to be known by you: the spirit, the manners and habits of the principal nations, based on those

[21] *Ibid.*, pp. 283 ff.—A very penetrating analysis of the concept of the "masse totale" and of eighteenth century political thought will appear in Professor Eric Voegelin's work on the history of political thought to be published soon by Macmillan Company. The writer had the privilege, for which he is very grateful, of reading many sections of the manuscript.

[22] Turgot perceives as distinct from the general progress the work of the great talents.

[23] R. C. Collingwood, *The Idea of History* (Oxford, 1946) p. 1. According to E. Fueter, *Geschichte der neueren Historiographie*, 3rd. ed. (München, 1936) p. 350, Voltaire planned his *Essai* as a continuation of Bossuet's *Discours* that had covered the course of history up to Charlemagne. Later he wanted to substitute for the *Discours* his own reflections on ancient history; he published them in 1756 and 1769 under the title *Philosophie de l'histoire*.

facts which it is not allowed to ignore." It is well known, however, that Voltaire himself was far from carrying out this program in his historical writings. He was not able to understand its full meaning. He did not attempt to perceive the "spirit, manners and habits of the principal nations," in the way Bossuet and Montesquieu had striven to perceive them in the political field: *le caractère des nations* in the first case; *l'esprit de chaque nation,* in the second. More than Bossuet, more even than Turgot, Voltaire was impressed by the age of Louis the Great. His mind was too skeptical and too subtle to believe in steady progress. In the introduction to his other great historical work, the *Siècle de Louis XIV,* he says:

> The person who thinks, or what is still rarer, the person of taste, counts but four centuries in the history of the world . . . four centuries which are prototypes of grandeur to the human mind, which give examples to posterity. . . . It is not that these four ages were exempt from misfortunes and crimes. . . . All centuries are similar insofar as the wickedness of men is concerned; yet I know only four centuries distinguished by great talents. . . . The fourth of these centuries is that which is called the century of Louis XIV, and among these four it is perhaps this which approaches most towards perfection. . . .

It did so, according to Voltaire, because in this age "human reason in general was perfected." To Voltaire the outstanding historical individuality was a Newton.

What Voltaire as an historian actually did was to survey the ages and the nations and to pass judgment on them according to his fixed standards. Ages and nations were hailed when they approached that great age as it was apprehended by Voltaire; they were condemned when they failed to do so. No attempt was made to grasp their specific "spirit," their individual "character." Instead, the pattern of the *Siècle* was applied because the core of human nature, which is the same everywhere and at all times, had fully and best developed therein.

The field of historical research was changed. Religion or politics no longer formed its center. The attack against the existing political regime began by depreciating the very values of politics as such. The figure of the great statesman, which had been prominent with Bossuet, disappeared in Voltaire's history, in which a great conqueror was, by necessity, first of all a great scourge. Even when he evaluted

the great king, he had to say, "Louis XIV did more for his nation than twenty of his predecessors; still he was far from doing all he could have done. . . .[24] Every period has produced heroes and statesmen; every nation has undergone revolution."[25] Voltaire assumed that these are not worthwhile topics for the historian. No true glory is attached to them.

Voltaire replaced the statesman as the secularized ideal of man by the learned man, the "savant," and he supplemented the concept of that large political community supposed to direct the destinies of Europe and the world by "this great society of all-wise men which exists everywhere, which is everywhere independent, and the existence of which brings some consolation for the evils which ambition and politics have spread over the earth."[26] In building the concept of this republic of savants, he was following in the wake of Leibnitz.

It was consistent with the idea of supreme rule assigned to the international society of savants and with the emphasis Voltaire always put on the teaching of morals, "the one and same moral doctrine taught by religion everywhere" (versus concrete dogma) that the *Essai* closed with words referring ironically to a marvel related by Jesuit missionaries in China! "If God had willed China to be Christian, would He have been satisfied by putting crosses in the air? Would He not rather have put them into the hearts of the Chinese?"[27]

The age and its historical thinkers, however, were not moved by the sceptical, resigned feeling of historical insularity expressed by Voltaire. For the representative expression of the spirit of the young generation of France we may turn to D'Alembert's *Discours préliminaire de l'Encyclopédie,* published as a preface to the first volume in 1751.[28] The discourse consists of two parts, the first dealing with the genealogy of the sciences, the second with a philosophical history of the advances of the human mind since the renaissance of letters,

[24] *Siècle* (*Oeuvres complètes,* Paris, 1878) XIV, 515.

[25] *Siècle, loc. cit.,* p. 155.

[26] *Ibid.,* p. 564.

[27] *Siècle,* XV, 84; cf. *Essai* XIII, 181; (in Asia) "the religious ceremonies are queer, the creeds absurd, but the precepts are just."

[28] References are made to the edition by F. Picavet (Paris, 1894).

this latter part providing one of the earliest examples of what was to be known as the history of ideas.[29] D'Alembert held no mean idea about the purpose of the *Encyclopédie:* if properly carried out, it would take the place of a complete library for a gentleman; it would do the same for a professional scholar, except in his own field.[30] "We dare say that if the ancients, who accomplished so many great things, had elaborated such an Encyclopedia and if this manuscript alone had escaped from the fire that destroyed the library of Alexandria, this would have been sufficient to console us for the loss of the rest." [31]

As for the course history takes and will take, the *Discours* assumed that men found so much advantage and pleasure in living in community that they wished to draw closer the ties of society. The history of the *progrès* the human mind had made since the Renaissance afforded an example of the natural trend. "In order not to go back too far," D'Alembert began with this period.

A few years before the first volume of the *Encyclopédie* was published, Montesquieu, in his *Esprit des lois,* had held the legal institutions of the Middle Ages in high esteem. He had been led to this admiration partly by his concrete political point of view. In this work he spoke of the "beautiful spectacle" offered by the feudal laws. "An old oak rises; first the eye perceives only the leaves; we approach; then, we see the trunk; but still we are not able to perceive the roots; in order to find these, we must penetrate beneath the soil." [32] Montesquieu then attempted to find the specific structure, the inner nature of the medieval laws. It is said correctly that the Franco-Germanic Middle Ages formed one of three favorite historical topics of Montesquieu, the other two being republican Rome and constitutional England.[33] Did he not speak about the Germans as "our fathers?"[34]

D'Alembert and his generation were loath to attempt to grasp an historical individuality in such a concrete way. To them the Middle

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 7.
[30] *Ibid.*, p. 150.
[31] *Ibid.*, p. 143.
[32] XXX, 1.
[33] F. Meinecke, *Entstehung des Historismus* (München, 1936), p. 175.
[34] *Esprit des Lois,* XXVIII, 17.

Ages were an unfortunate period. They judged them more harshly than Turgot had done a year earlier: "The masterworks which the ancients had accomplished in almost every sphere had been forgotten" for twelve centuries.[35] Like Turgot, however, D'Alembert acknowledged the debt mankind owed to Italy for the renaissance of arts and letters; and again like Turgot, D'Alembert stressed the fact that the Middle Ages had not been more sterile than any other period in history in bringing forth great genius. "Human nature is always the same. But how could these few great men prevail against the darkness that surrounded them, against the atmosphere of their times . . . There is an air that one breathes without being aware of it and to this air one owes one's life: the great men of that age were deprived of such comfort."

We find in the *Discours* some historical evaluations reminiscent of Voltaire. The modern age is superior in philosophy to the ancient; mankind is indebted for the progress made in this direction to no single man more than to Newton. On the other hand it is admitted that the philosophical spirit characteristic of the generation of the *Encyclopédie,* a spirit "that wants to see all and is unwilling to grant any supposition," was instrumental in bringing about the decline of the belles-lettres from the height they had reached during the age of Louis XIV.[36]

The basic approach of the *Encyclopédie,* and D'Alembert especially, becomes evident in a parallel which is drawn between the nature of the universe and the ocean, on the surface of which some islands of different size may be seen, while their connection with the continent cannot be known by us.[37] Any search for an underlying unity, for the fundamentals has been discarded by this generation.

One could assume, however, that these men were ready to explore those "islands" to which their inquiry was restricted, both in the physical sphere as well as in that of history. They had claimed that nature should be known not by vague analogies but by deliberate study of phenomena. But Rousseau, when he was concerned with

[35] *loc. cit.,* p. 76.
[36] *Ibid.,* pp. 118 ff.
[37] *Ibid.,* p. 30.

topics like the development of human society and its political or social structure, dismissed on principle the study of concrete phenomena.

We are not concerned here with the influence Rousseau's thought exercised on the historical writing of his and following generations. It was substantial without any doubt. We wish to look at his own basic approach to the writing of history, and this, we surmise, remained unchanged during his political writing. At the very opening of the *Social Contract,* after having stated that man is born free and everywhere is in chains, Rousseau asks the question on this historical development, "How did this change come about?" The answer is, "I do not know." The philosopher continues in a similar vein; the social order does not come from nature; therefore it *must* be founded on conventions. When Rosseau came to the decisive moment when the social contract was to be introduced, he simply said, "I suppose men have reached the point . . ."[38] When he set out to describe the original conditions of man from which the present society developed, he was well aware that he was speaking "of a state which no longer exists, perhaps never did exist and probably never will exist."[39] Rousseau was consistent from his point of view when, in order to find out about this state, he recommended throwing aside "all the scientific books" and concentrating on "meditating on the first and most simple operations of the human soul."[40] Certainly this was a thoroughly anti-historical way to speak of man: "Let us begin by laying all the facts aside as they do not affect the question."[41]

The climax of "enlightened," "progressive" historical writing is found in Condorcet's *Tableau historique des progrès de l'esprit humain* (1794), than which there have not been many more biased works in the history of history and few more hostile to positive religion. The story of the *philosophe* who had acquired fame as a mathematician and wrote his *Tableau* while hiding from his executioners and who kept his optimistic view of mankind until his last day is impres-

[38] I, 6; Everyman's Library Edition, p. 14.

[39] "Discourse on the Origin of Inequality," *loc. cit.,* p. 169.

[40] *loc. cit.,* p. 171.

[41] *loc. cit.,* p. 175. Rousseau continues: "The investigations we may enter into in treating this subject must not be considered as historical truths, but only as mere conditional and hypothetical reasonings."

sive from a human point of view and typical of the terror years of the French Revolution. "Meditation," wrote Condorcet, "upon the picture presented by history affords to the philosopher an asylum where the recollection of his persecutors does not haunt him . . . here he lives in the company of those who are his true fellows in an elysium that his reason has created." He did not survive this statement long.

Condorcet surveyed, in the *Tableau*, the advances of the human spirit, dividing these into ten periods. The last deals with the progress to be achieved in the future, attempting to outline this on the basis of results already accomplished. These advances, he found, promised an ever-increasing equality among and within the nations.

Turgot had perceived progress to be attained in history only with the *masse totale* but he was aware that beside or above this *masse* great individuals existed and strove in the different ages and spheres, a group not at all negligible to the historian. Condorcet suggested a radical change in the writing of history: it should deal no longer with the history of a relatively few men; rather it should become the story of all those who constitute *la masse du genre humain*. The correct amount of improvement in the condition of man would be grasped only when dealing with "the unknown, the neglected, the most numerous part of mankind."[42] In this way Condorcet became aware of the great continuity in history. He perceived that the simple, most necessary commodities to maintain the life of the humble French peasant of his time were due to the centuries-long effort of human history and science, which could be traced back to the victory of Salamis, and without which, the *philosophe* felt, the darkness of oriental despotism would have succeeded in enveloping the whole globe.[43] Human history thus truly formed a whole.

But in surveying this history, Condorcet, even more arbitrarily than Turgot had done, picked up one thread out of the fullness and variety of historical life and made it the common denominator for all other historical trends. Clearly he followed in the wake of Turgot and D'Alembert, though exaggerating their points of view. Religious

[42] *Tableau historique des progrès de l'esprit humain* (Paris 1825) pp. 259, 261.

[43] *Ibid.*, p. 262.

as well as political values have no interest and no importance for him, and what is left is exclusively the authority of the *esprit philosophe*. Not the great statesmen and rulers, not the eminent poets and artists, but Aristotle, Leibnitz and, above all, Newton afford examples of the greatest men history has produced. It is according to this view that Condorcet discussed *les progrès de l'esprit humain*, that he understood history to be intellectual progress. While he readily admitted "the illimitable perfectibility of mankind," [44] he was not loath to speak of one great period of retrogression in history, the "sixth period," which he summarized as the decay of enlightened knowledge until the beginning of its restoration at the time of the crusades. "The triumph of Christianity was the signal of the full decay of science and philosophy," [45] he wrote, influenced perhaps by Gibbon, but exaggerating also the more reserved attitude of the British historian. Due to his exclusive interest in the advance of humane studies, Condorcet showed little understanding of Rome.[46] Even of Roman law his final judgment was that mankind was indebted to it for a small number of useful truths and for many tyrannical prejudices.[47]

The *Tableau historique* was written in 1794. Three years later [48] a book was published that marked the turn of the intellectual current in France: *Les Considérations sur la France* by Joseph de Maistre. Through the writing one theme runs: Man never knew what he was achieving in history. This is especially true of the time of the French revolution. All history developed against human plans.[49] Again, no better example can be cited for this thesis than what happened during the great French crisis. We watch the revolution succeed everywhere,

[44] *Ibid.*, pp. 33, 220.

[45] *Ibid.*, p. 125.

[46] *Ibid.*, pp. 116 ff; K. Breysig, *Die Meister der entwickelnden Geschichtsforschung* (Breslau, 1936) p. 125.

[47] *Ibid.*, p. 118.

[48] Concerning the time when the book was written, cf. Comte J. de Maistre, *Oeuvres* (Paris, 1876) I, 116; chapt. X, § 1 ". . . au moment où j'écris (4 janvier 1797) . . ." Usually 1796 is given as the year of its publication.

[49] De Maistre comes close to Vico's famous formula: "homo non intelligendo fit omnia." It is still an open question how far a real influence was exercised by the great Neapolitan thinker on De Maistre; cf. E. Gianturco *Joseph de Maistre and Giambattista Vico* (New York, 1937).

De Maistre asserts, but this is not due to the outstanding qualities and to the superior planning of its leaders. On the contrary, setting apart their moral perversity, these revolutionists excel by their intellectual mediocrity. Superior forces are at work which give them victory on the battlefield and success in the internal strife. "Tout leur a réussi." The hand of God in human history is clearly shown in these events.

The Savoyard noble introduces also the second theme observed in all the French historical works with which we are concerned, that of French nationalism, of France's special vocation in history. If France is bitterly castigated in these days, if her blood is shed as never before, the reason is that this nation, which is especially dear to God, which had been assigned by Him a special mission, the magistracy of Europe, deserted this mission. Therefore a punishment was inflicted on it such as men had not witnessed for a long time.[50] According to De Maistre, this supernatural background gives the French Revolution its unique character. The human individual as such does not count. "Robespierre, Collot or Barère never planned to establish the revolutionary government or the rule of terror. They were led to it by circumstances without knowing it. Never again shall we see anything similar happen."[51] But such punishment is necessary in order that salvation and regeneration may become possible eventually. "France is called upon to bring forth the change in minds."[52]

De Maistre clearly contradicted the thought of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment. To him, religion is at the base of every human institution. Religion animates and maintains every human institution, while what he calls "philosophism" cannot even produce a true popular fête. Thus religion, and not some conscious deliberation, was also at the foundation of all concrete constitutions and institutions.[53] De Maistre comes to grips with his age and alludes to the coming one. The natural constitution of a nation, he affirms, can be but its own historical constitution; no abstract, no general solutions are possible in political life. "I have seen Frenchmen, Italians, Russians; I owe it

[50] *loc. cit.*, p. 15.
[51] *Ibid.*, p. 12.
[52] *Ibid.*, p. 30.
[53] *Ibid.*, pp. 55 ff.

to Montesquieu that I am quite aware 'qu'on peut être Persan'; but never did I meet *l'homme* as such."[54] Like Burke, De Maistre took his analogies from the sphere of vegetable life. The new political institutions, he claimed, were planted on the surface of the soil, while the ancient ones were rooted in it.[55] Following the lead of Montesquieu and Burke, he claimed the necessity of looking for concrete circumstances in political life, of watching historical individuality and its uniqueness: thus of doing just the contrary of what the French of his age did. In this politico-historical sphere the position of De Maistre would mean not a counter-revolution, but the contrary of what the revolution did.[56]

The same year, 1797, that brought forth the *Considérations* of De Maistre produced also the first book of Chateaubriand, the *Essai historique sur les révolutions anciennes et modernes.*[57] Mindful of the work to which the author owed his fame, this first book has been called with some exaggeration the *Génie des révolutions.*

It is surprising that no standard biography of Chateaubriand has been written.[58] In spite of many beautiful pages[59] dedicated to René, or *"l'enchanteur"*, his character varies from presentation to presentation offered us. It seems certain, however, that Chateaubriand belonged to more than one world, to more than one age. He had emigrated not only from the old continent, temporarily at least, but also from the class into which he was born. And, like Tocqueville, who a generation later than the author of *Atala* and the *Génie du christianisme* was to perform in a more penetrating way much of what the

[54] *Ibid.*, p. 68.

[55] *Ibid.*, p. 111.

[56] *Ibid.*, p. 135.

[57] The *Essai* was printed in London in 1796 and sold to the public in 1797 according to Chateaubriand's *advertissement* to the edition of 1826. The author added in the new edition self-critical and explanatory notes. The following analysis is concerned with the original text.

[58] However, we must be grateful that, so far, Mr. Emil Ludwig has not added to his list of biographies a *vie romancée* of the author of the *Génie;* M. Maurois, of course, has done his bit already.

[59] I would list here much of H. Gillot, *Chateaubriand* (Paris, 1934), and a number of pages devoted to the author of *René* in Thibaudet's *Histoire de la littérature française depuis 1789* (Paris, 1936).

former had attempted, Chateaubriand had rid himself of most of the prejudices of his class but had never forgotten its true traditions. Thibaudet is right: Much of the intellectual life of the father of French romanticism can be understood by remembering that he often thought of himself as being a last link in a long chain, of being an end. "Je suis le dernier qui . . ." "The great evil consists in the fact that we do not belong to our century," "Le mal, le grand mal, c'est que nous ne sommes point de notre siècle," Chateaubriand wrote in one of the first pages of his first book.[60]

In the last chapter of the *Mémoires d'outre-tombe* Chateaubriand presented himself in somewhat another light, emphasizing his function as a *trait-d'union* between two worlds: "I found myself between two centuries, as if at the confluence of two rivers; I plunged into their troubled waters, receding regretfully from the old bank, where I was born, and hopefully swimming towards a shore unknown." [61] In spite of the tensions which almost tore his soul apart, in spite of the relentless struggle between pessimism and a will for action, between much superficial egotistic sentimentalism and a slightly operatic display of chivalry, he was right and justified in speaking in these pages of himself as almost the only one among all the French authors of his age who bore a likeness to his works. "Traveller, soldier, publicist, and minister; in the forests I sang the forests, on vessels I described the ocean, and in the camps I spoke of arms, in exile I learned about exile, and at courts, in political affairs, and in assemblies I studied princes, politics and laws . . . I found myself involved in war and peace; I signed treaties and protocols; I attended sieges, congresses, and conclaves; I watched thrones rebuilt and demolished; I made history and thus I was able to write it." We may think of the proud statement of Polybius, "Those who have not been through the events do not succeed in arousing the interest of their readers," and of the attacks made by him and Bodin against merely scholarly historical writing. Chateaubriand would gladly have acceded to them.

The subject of the *Essay on Revolutions* is not lacking in vastness: Five ancient and seven modern revolutions were to be analysed and

[60] *Essai sur les révolutions anciennes et modernes* I, 3. References are made to *Oeuvres* (Paris, 1859).

[61] Edition of E. Biré, VI, 474 ff.

compared with the French Revolution. But while only the first two actually received the treatment which the author planned for twelve, many other topics, more or less related to the main theme, were discussed. Chapter 57 of the second volume brought the work to an end with the deservedly famous beautiful aria which describes the night spent with the savages of America. It was his purpose, the young author said on his passage to the New Continent, to put his soul into every topic and certainly he kept this purpose when he dealt with the sad years he spent as a poor and unknown refugee in England, busying himself "with making the stupid children of his neighbors repeat some words in French" [62] and with the historical study of the revolutions which would introduce him into the world of letters.

It is not difficult to grasp the intellectual background of the book. It is permeated with a sceptical pessimism that extends into almost every sphere. Against this attitude stands, as a solitary exception, the homage paid to Rosseau, the author of *Émile*. "There are perhaps five books we must read—*Émile* is one of them." [63] From the author of *Émile* and of the two *Discourses* Chateaubriand took his belief in the noble savage, exemplified for him by the "happy" Scythians in ancient times and in modern times by the Swiss and the American Indians, and his trust in the belief that intellectual progress can be achieved only at the expense of the qualities of character.

Basic to the historical attitude of the young Chateaubriand is the further belief that history moves in cycles, that it "repeats;" that therefore the study of one period will bring forth cogent analogies with another. From this point of view, elaborating on a main theme of Montesquieu, he presents a few interesting parallels as that between the parts played in history by Macedonia and Prussia,[64] and even more extravagant ones, as the parallel between Persia and the German Empire, between Darius and the Emperor Leopold II, and between Xerxes and Francis I.[65] There are more in the sphere of intellectual history, for instance, the comparison of Pythagoras with

[62] *Loc. cit.*, II, 69.
[63] *Ibid.*, II, 145.
[64] *Ibid.*, I, 221. The passage was written not later than 1797!
[65] *Ibid.*, I, 237 ff., 273 ff.

Bernardin de St. Pierre.[66] Yet in the *Essay*, as well as in the later historical writings of Chateaubriand, it would not be worthwhile to search for solid historical scholarship. There are many other authors who can be praised for this achievement, and sometimes for this alone. If there is a contribution which the author of *René* made to history, it is certainly not to be found in this respect.

The cyclical approach to history leads easily to determinism—we may think of Spengler in modern times. Considering the rigidity of Chateaubriand's attitude, such a result was a necessity with him.[67] "Man repeats himself incessantly; even the events which do not depend on him, which seem to be due to chance alone, are reproduced time and again." Very much like Montesquieu, Chateaubriand says, "From the same causes result the same consequences."[68] While these trends of the author's mind may be of interest for his biography and for the characterisation of the period, the influence which Chateaubriand exercised was at no time in his life due to his ideology, to the impressiveness of his thought. Still we may stress here his qualified belief in the sovereignty of the people, which he held when he wrote the *Essai*,[69] and his slightly veiled admission that, like the religions of ancient times, so in his own period, Christianity had come to an end. Togethor with the monarchy "religion has vanished",[70] at least in France. The heading of Chapter 55 reads, "Which religion will replace Christianity?" One cannot find that more is said there in defense of religion than is contained in the insistence, very much like Machiavelli's, on the necessity of the existence of a religion for the sake of healthy political conditions. From this point of view, hardly to be called a religious one, Chateaubriand heaps blame on the French *philosophes* whose work he calls merely destructive, likening it to the main historical function of Greek philosophy.[71] Remarks to

[66] *Ibid.*, I, 195 ff.

[67] E. G., II, 239 ff., I 300 ff.

[68] *Ibid.*, I, 43. Chateaubriand comes close to using the very words of Comte's formula: "savoir pour prévoir;" cf. I, 58.

[69] *Ibid.*, II, 17.

[70] II, 193 f., 220.

[71] I, 83; II, 187.

be found in the last three chapters of the *Essai* on the character of the clergy remind us of the superficial and bigoted statements written on this subject when "the night of Enlightenment had fallen upon the earth," [72] for instance those of Condorcet.[73] Chateaubriand, however, makes in this connection the statement that the Christian religion will find its last refuge in Germany, due to the moral strength of the people there and to the virtue and intelligence of its clergy.[74] In his notes to the *Essai,* which the author prepared for the edition of 1826, he took pains to point out the inconsistency pervading his first work. "C'est un chaos," [75] he did not tire of repeating. Yet, while not thinking of the essay as having an elaborate system (which work of the "enchanter" does possess such pattern?), certain definite attitudes are underlying and recurrent, but they are hardly those we are looking for in considering the history of historical writing.

The continuous parallels between revolutionary France and classic antiquity are certainly arbitrary and irritating. Nevertheless, in addition to what may be observed in the history of political thought and in the history of fine arts and of music (think of the influence of the operas of Gluck), Chateaubriand sensed correctly a contemporary trend when he spoke of the French as imitating the ancients.[76] This immature paralleling, the belief that there is "nothing new in the historical cycles," would be a useful preliminary stage if out of it an interest in the past, a respect for historical tradition developed. In this case it would contribute to a passionate study of history. Of course, such a metamorphosis would be due rather to the artistic qualities of the author than to any consequences of his ideology.

If we bear in mind the preparatory steps of Boulainvilliers, Montesquieu, Turgot or the Scottish historian Robertson, it is surprising to find how completely Chateaubriand ignored the Middle Ages in the *Essai.* One cannot argue that actually he carried out only the section of his work that dealt with ancient Greece. Whenever he

[72] The formulation is Professor Voegelin's.

[73] Cf. also *Ibid.,* I, 231; II, 214.

[74] *Ibid.,* II, 220.

[75] *Ibid.,* e.g., preface, p. xxii.

[76] *Ibid.,* I, 302.

refers to the medieval period, as for example in his survey of the history of philosophy,[77] he reveals an impressive lack of understanding, truly worthy of a *philosophe*.

But no *philosophe* would have been able to give characterisations like those which the *Essai* presents of Fox and Pitt,[78] of Malesherbes and Rousseau [79], or write the pages on the execution of Louis XVI. In these pages a living individuality is sensed, most personal qualities and gestures are grasped; thereby they are highly superior to the character studies of Montesquieu.[80] There is still much rhetorical antithesis to be found in the young Chateaubriand, but the reader will hardly forget the way in which he is introduced to the evaluation of the oratorical art of Pitt. Nothing in the *Essai,* however, reminds one of Bossuet's understanding and appreciation of the problem of political power. On the other hand, Chateaubriand introduces into the analysis of the contemporary intellectual situation new factors, hitherto unheard of, like "that vague restlessness peculiar to our hearts, that makes us dislike equally our happiness and our misery, and that will cast us from revolution to revolution until the last day. Where does this restlessness come from?" [81] The author does not know; and he has to admit the same ignorance when he asks what the French should have done in the situation in which they found themselves at the end of the eighteenth century. Here, however, Chateaubriand qualifies the confession of his ignorance, inasmuch as he adds, "In no way should they follow foreign doctrines." [82] Can we deduce from this remark that, in the wake of Burke, the discovery of the personality of the nation is in the making?

We find in the *Essai* reminders of earlier French historians, like the saying of Turgot that "the evils inseparable from revolutions disappear; the good remains . . ." But the original version has lost much

[77] Cf. *Ibid.*, II, 119, on "cette malheureuse philosophie scolastique," or "cet esprit métaphysique si inutile aux hommes," I, 112.

[78] *Ibid.*, I, 158 ff.

[79] *Ibid.*, II, 90 ff., 139 ff.

[80] "Réflésions sur le caractère de quelques princes . . ." in *Mélanges inédits* (1892).

[81] *Essai,* I, 314.

[82] *Ibid.*, I, 319.

of its color in the new version: "Il y a tourjours quelque chose de bon dans une revolution."[83] The main impression the *Essai* gives is that of the inevitability of revolution, once in ancient Greece and now in modern France.[84]

We may mention in passing such expressions of cheap sentimental pessimism as his explanation of the Protestant Reformation, "because a monk thought it bad that the Pope bestowed on another order than his own the right to sell indulgences in Germany," "Let us deplore the human species," "pleurons sur le genre humain";[85] or his lack of any sense of chronology, as a substitute for which he takes delight in saying "soon": The warfare between Guelfs and Ghibellines was *soon* followed by the crusades; the renaissance of letters was *soon* followed by the reformation.[86]

Chateaubriand wrote in the *Génie*,[87] "We are convinced that the great writers put their own story into their works," and he did so. A sentence of the *Essai*, "After all, I do not know whether a man is ever completely sure of what he really thinks,"[88] may be characteristic of the author's mind in these early years. Yet in this respect we may safely assume that a true conversion occurred with Chateaubriand, at least in the religious sphere.

In the period to which the *Essai* belongs all history was finally identical to Chateaubriand; the meaning and the core of the history of ancient Greece and contemporary France were the same. A decisive change in position was made in the *Génie* (1802). In it a gulf not to be bridged separates the period of heathen antiquity from the Christian era. This is not to say that Chateaubriand did not feel deeply sympathetic with the great men, especially with the poets and prose writers, of classic antiquity. Monographs have been devoted to the analysis of

[83] *Ibid.*, II, 104.

[84] *Ibid.*, II, 130; also footnote. Chateaubriand adds in 1826: "Si j'ai écrit quelque chose de bon dans ma vie, il faut y comprendre cette note."

[85] II, 184.

[86] *Ibid.*, II, 178, 180.

[87] *Génie*, II, 1, 3.

[88] *loc. cit.*, II, 132.

his attitude towards Homer and Virgil,[89] and the reader of the *Génie* may easily grasp how thoroughly the author enjoyed and how congenially he evaluated many of the beauties of the classic epics. Furthermore, he used the word Christianity in a broad sense and he did not hesitate to bring in as an example of Christian poetry even Voltaire, whose anti-Christian way of thought he had exposed in the *Essai*. However, he was not inconsistent in this. He strove to prove that Christianity had impressed on its age a new spirit and a higher morality to which even the reluctant had to submit if they wanted to succeed as poets or thinkers. Though the *Génie* is far from grasping and emphasising the uniqueness of the metaphysical values of Christianity, it is a basic tenet of its author that "it added new strings to the soul."[90] Though not treated exhaustively, though hardly understood fully, Christianity and the ages it embraced are certainly presented in the *Génie* as a unique historical phenomenon, not linked with any other period of human history. Chateaubriand understood the historical uniqueness of Christianity especially in the realms of ethics and esthetics.[91] (The historian of historical writing is reminded of Winckelmann, who a generation earlier perceived and evoked ancient Greek art as a unique historical phenomenon.) If we agree with a distinguished British thinker that the historian in order to understand the past must re-enact it in his own mind,[92] if we are willing to expand this statement by saying that the historian understands the past by re-living it, there is no doubt that a thorough change in Chateaubriand's mind underlay his approach in the *Génie*. It is not necessary to recall as additional evidence the words, "We are convinced that the great writers have always put their own story into their writings. When one describes the feelings of others, he is only giving a good description of his own heart. The best part of a genius is made out of reminiscences."[93] This is a position far from that held in the *Essai*, where the

[89] Louis Hastings Naylor, *Chateaubriand and Virgil* (Baltimore, 1940); Charles R. Hart, *Chateaubriand and Homer* (Baltimore, 1928).

[90] *Génie du Christianisme* (references made are to the edition of Paris, 1876) I, 241; IIe partie, III, 4.

[91] *Ibid.*, I, 193; Ie, II, 1.

[92] *Génie*, I, 91; Ie, IV, 3; cf. II, 16, III e, II, 2.

[93] *Génie*, I, 179 f.; IIe, I, 3.

author wondered whether one ever can feel completely sure of what one really thinks. While other writings of Chateaubriand, like the *Martyrs*, have an historical background in so far as they tell us what could happen, (thus the fascination they exercised on a mind like that of Thierry), the *Génie* is real historical writing. It restricts itself to the sphere of what did happen.[94]

Yet it is not true that the *Génie* differs *toto coelo* from the *Essai*. Themes of the first work recur in the later book, like that of the destructive function of the merely learned ages[95] or the allusions which place the author among the *infortunés*.[96] Again, and in an even more elaborate way, emphasis is given to that vagueness in the human soul which the author was fond of observing. "Du vague des passions" is the title given to the closing chapter of the third book. "Disgusted by their age, afraid of their religion, these souls have remained with the world without giving themselves to it: then they have become the prey of a thousand chimeras, and that culpable melancholy was seen to develop that is bred among passions when they, without having an object, consume themselves in a solitary heart." [97] Milton is praised in the *Génie* for the vagueness and the terror with which he endowed his description of death.[98] There occur also in the *Génie* themes taken from other authors. The reader, however, may well reflect upon how much and how characteristically these themes were changed, such as the description of the life going on in the virgin forests of America with the old oaks sinking into dust. For Turgot this illustrated the history of progress, while for Chateaubriand it suggested exclusively general evanescence: "Ainsi tout tombe, tout s'anéantit." [99]

"Is there nothing marvelous to be found in the times of Roland and Godfrey," Chateaubriand asked, "or in the ages of the kingdoms of Jerusalem and Cyprus?" He gave the answer immediately: "These times were marvelous indeed, but they have passed." [100] What was

[94] For the distinction cf. Collingwood, *loc. cit.*, p. 239.
[95] *Génie*, I, 91; Ie, IV, 3; cf. II, 16, IIIe, II, 2.
[96] *Ibid.*, I, 140; Ie, V. 14.
[97] *Ibid.*, I, 261; IIe, III, 9.
[98] *Ibid.*, I, 298; IIe, IV, 14.
[99] *Ibid.*, I, 88; Ie, IV, 2.
[100] *Ibid.*, II, 135 f.; IVe, II, 8.

most marvelous on earth was to be found only in history. A new dignity, therefore, was bestowed on history, and, by implication, this new historical aspect destroyed the belief in progress. Although he put imagination into the center of observation, Chateaubriand was aware that this faculty gave way in the course of time because of the progress of the natural sciences. To him, however, human thought had its full poetical grandeur and all of its beauty only in the ages in which imagination had prevailed.[101] He denied explicitly that any progress in metaphysics had been made by his age.[102] He proceeded to call an institution beautiful because of its very antiquity and its tradition;[103] then it is essentially linked with our way of life. A monument is truly venerable only when "a long history is, so to say, impressed on its vaults which centuries have darkened" and when its origins lose themselves "in the night of ages."[104] The value of the vague reappears, but more important to us is another fact: According to Chateaubriand's basic attitude in the *Génie* the ages of Christianity are superior to those of earlier history. Thus the gates are now thrown open for a new evaluation of the Middle Ages. This is true especially for French history, since the only period of a truly poetic character in that history belongs to Christianity. It is the time of chivalry. Chateaubriand considered it superior to the preceding and to the following ages.[105]

However, this did not mean that the author of the *Génie* was able to relive all of medieval history; he failed conspicuously when he attempted to recreate the lives of the early saints and the monastic orders. Moreover, there has seldom been written a chapter on the Middle Ages which more deserved the label "romantic" with all its bad implications and connotations than the pages in the *Génie* on "the life and the manners of the knights."[106] Yet the problem as such, medieval life as a proper topic for historical presentation, was grasped, and the author succeeded in reliving certain aspects of

[101] *Ibid.*, II, 26 f.; IIIe, II, 6.
[102] *Ibid.*, II, 17; IIIe, II, 3.
[103] *Ibid.*, II, 153 f.; IVe, III, 3.
[104] *Ibid.*, I 349; IIIe, I, 8.
[105] *Ibid.*, II, 213; IVe, V, 1;—I, 226; IIe, II, 11.
[106] *Ibid.*, II, 220; IVe, V, 4.

medieval art and poetry. Due to his basic approach he sensed the peculiar, the unique character of medieval life while he was not capable of exhausting it. "The gothic order, in the midst of its barbaric proportions, has nevertheless a beauty that is peculiar to it." [107] Chateaubriand remained faithful to his motto; he put his soul also into the chapters he wrote on the Middle Ages. Boulainvilliers and Montesquieu were led to the discovery and appreciation of the Middle Ages by their political thought. Chateaubriand followed religious and esthetic inspiration; thus his attempt to recreate was more successful: "Ancient France seems to revive; one expects to see those singular costumes, and the people so different from those of today." [108]

The same approach to history permeates all of the *Génie*. "Putting his soul" into the different ages and personalities, Chateaubriand succeeds only partly in reliving them; but he does succeed to some extent and new light is thrown on them. His success as well as his failure is due to his character, to this "soul" that the reader senses everywhere. To him the century of Louis XIV is still the great age of French history, though in part for reasons different from those of Voltaire's *Essay*. He certainly grasps the grandeur of the *Comedy* of Dante only to a small extent. Though he is partly responsible for the legend of the melancholy and lonely Virgil, he knew how to make his story impressive, as are also "his" Pascal and "his" Racine. Are not some parts of the Homeric epics told and analyzed in a perfect way in the *Génie?*

The mind of the author was not exclusively restricted to the spheres of art and poetry. He perceived the many national individualities emerging in history under the influence of Christianity and he wished to present the variety of their characters. "How many characteristic features do these new nations offer!" He briefly outlined the Germans, the Italians, the Spaniards, the English, and the French, these latter "the oldest sons of antiquity, Roman by their genius, Greek by their character, *travaillés d'une certaine grandeur.*" [109] In all this, however, no evidence of a genuine political evaluation was shown. Some sentences on ancient Rome and the Romans, particularly lacking in under-

[107] *Ibid.*, I, 349; IIIe, I, 8.
[108] *Ibid.*, I, 349.
[109] *Ibid.*, II, 40 f.; IIIe, III, 5;—II, 125; IVe, II, 1.

standing, strengthen that conviction. Bossuet, whom Chateaubriand admired in many other respects, had not opened this realm to him. But few historical writers had such a strongly developed sense for the variety of characters and their aspects offered in history and few knew how to enjoy them as well as did the author of the *Génie.*

At the end of the *Essai* Chateaubriand asked what religion would be the substitute for Christianity. A question of similar importance was asked at the end of the *Génie,* but this time it had a distinctly different character. It did not inquire about the future; it had an historical significance: "What would be the condition of society today," the heading of the last chapter reads, "if Christianity had not appeared on earth?" And this was the answer the author offered: "All that one can surmise is that after prolonged civil wars and a general revolt of several centuries, the human race would have found itself reduced to a few people wandering over ruins."[110] In the same vein the answer is given on the historical time of the birth of the Saviour: "Christ arrived as a great and happy event to counterbalance the flood of the barbarians and the general corruption of manners."[111] The world of history took on another aspect from that time.

The pessimistic scepticism of the first work was replaced in the *Génie* by a confidence strengthened by what seemed to be highly disturbing signs and events of the author's time. Once Rome was rich and powerful; now the splendor was gone; the eternal city was reduced to misery. But by this, Chateaubriand felt convinced, it returned to the poverty and purity of the Gospel Age. What many took for the fall of the Church turned out to be her rebuilding. "The Cross has reappeared."[112]

In the avant-propos to the *Études historiques,* dated March, 1831, Chateaubriand referred to this work as the longest of his life, the one to which he had given more research, care, and time than to any other, the one in which he had put more ideas and facts. Before he published this last of his historical books, the seeds he had sown in the *Génie,* and other writings, had already begun to bear fruit in that

[110] *Ibid.,* II, 287; IVe, VI, 13.
[111] *Ibid.,* II, 294; IVe, VI, 13.
[112] *Ibid.,* II, 255; IVe, VI, 7.

decade, 1820-1830, so remarkable for European intellectual history.

The plan to write the *Études* goes back to 1811, as M. Dollinger proved in a careful though not exhaustive study dedicated to this work.[113] Before its publication in 1831, Thierry, to whom the *Études* refer frequently and always in a complimentary vein, wrote in 1821 ten letters "Sur l'Histoire de France" in the *Courrier Français* and gave his *Histoire de la conquête de l'angleterre* to the public in 1825. "Reading the *Martyrs* made Thierry an historian," Lord Acton wrote.[114] The volumes of Barante's *Histoire des ducs de Bourgogne* appeared from 1824 to 1826. Finally, though from another historical approach, Guizot had begun his *Cours d'histoire moderne* in 1829,[115] insisting once more on the idea of progress in history.

Chateaubriand introduced the reader to the *Études* in a long preface, which is one of the three decisive prefaces to historical writings in the first half of the nineteenth century, the two others being that to Ranke's first book in 1824 and that to Barante's *Histoire* of the same year. In it were set forth the principles to be carried out in this book which was to survey the history of the decaying Roman Empire and of medieval and modern France up to Louis XVI. Satisfactory evidence has been brought forth to prove that the preface was actually written after the rest of the work had been finished. The author started to work at it in the years 1811-1814; he took it up again from 1816-1820; he had finished a first draft by 1826; he completed the book, as far as it ever was completed, from 1826-1830. Some minor changes were made and the preface was added in the spring of 1831.[116] The reader, therefore, must not feel surprised if he cannot trace in the *Études* all the ideas discussed in the preface,[117] but some of the

[113] Albert Dollinger, *Les Études historiques de Chauteaubriand* (Paris, 1932).

[114] Cf. my article, "The Correspondence between Lord Acton and Bishop Creighton", *Cambridge Historical Journal* VI (1940), 308.

[115] On Guizot's course cf. G. P. Gooch, *History and Historians in the XIXth century* (London, 1920) pp. 188 ff.

[116] Dollinger, *loc. cit.*, pp. 59 ff., 208 ff. *Études historiques* (references to *Oeuvres*, ed. Paris, 1860) II, 123, footnote 1; here Chateaubriand speaks of correcting on August 13, 1830—a few days after the July revolution—the proofs made before July 27.

[117] Among them the much discussed, but hardly important system of the *Trois*

formulations given there expressed well what the author had attempted to do.

Chateaubriand repeated his basic historical conviction expressed in the *Génie*: "Le monde moderne prend naissance au pied de la croix," "The modern world was born at the foot of the cross: Everything human changed with Christianity."[118] With this point of view he spoke of Augustine and Jerome as men of modern times: "Christianity made vibrate in the hearts a string never touched before; it created men of dreaming, of sadness, of restlessness, men of passion—they have for refuge but eternity."[119] A main theme of the *Génie* is elaborated here. He also expanded his remarks in the earlier work on the nature of history. He took his start in the preface from a quotation taken from a speech of Condorcet in 1792, in which the author of the *Esquisse d'un tableau historique* gave vent to his hatred of the remnants and documents of the past: "Il faut envelopper ces depôts dans une destruction commune." Chateaubriand asked his contemporaries, "And we, do we cherish what once has been?"[120] Then he surveyed the growth of the historical sense in France up to the exclamation equally characteristic of the author and of his age: "Everything today takes the shape of history!"[121] However tempting the desire, lack of space forbids retracing here his analysis and evaluation of the contemporary trends in historical writing; lack of space equally forbids attempting to place him against the background of international intellectual currents at the time he wrote the *Études*. But we must ask, "What did history mean to him?" He states it clearly, "We must come to see with our own eyes the physiognomy of the ages."[122] He discussed the possible ways to achieve this. He discussed what usually are called the "historical sources," so that much of what Burckhardt had to say two generations later and Collingwood, after more than a cen-

vérités in history; on them cf. Dollinger, *loc. cit.*, and Philippe André-Vincent, *Les idées politiques de Chateaubriand* (Montpellier, 1936); in the *Études historiques*, Préface, pp. 89 ff. and 120 ff.; Exposition, 129 ff.; III, 82.

[118] *Etudes*, I, 90, 145; III, 77.

[119] *Ibid.*, II, 271.

[120] *Ibid.*, I, 25 ff.

[121] *Ibid.*, I, 64.

[122] *Ibid.*, I, 20.

tury, can actually be found in the preface to the *Études.*[123] "History is not a work of philosophy; it is a *tableau,* a picture. To the task of narrating must be added that of representing the objects. One must know how to draw and to paint at the same time." The Enlightenment considered in its historical writings the sameness of human nature throughout the centuries. Chateaubriand insisted on presenting what had changed in history: "C'étoit un autre monde."[124] To impress that variety, that diversity on the reader, while still bearing in mind the slow work of a few great permanent trends, this was the task of the historian according to the author of the *Études,* a task very far from what the writer of the *Essai* had once conceived. How far and in what ways did Chateaubriand himself succeed in achieving this aim?

M. Dollinger has shown convincingly how slight was the research done for the *Études* and how unsatisfactory were Chateaubriand's achievements in historical criticism: "As far as the history of the Emperors is concerned, he drew from different sources, taking a detail from Crevier, a project from Gibbon, an idea from Tillemont, a remark from Montesquieu, a note from Guizot. For the history of the Church he was satisfied with one source, Fleury, whom he followed and often simply copied."[125] And the French scholar adds, "One may say that criticism of sources is simply non-existent in the *Études* . . . Chateaubriand, simply adopts the results of the criticism of Tillemont . . . the correctness as well as the deficiencies of his predecessors are his own." Furthermore, he usually does not even refer to the authors he despoiled so thoroughly.[126] M. Dollinger then proceeds to wonder about the lack of interest Chateaubriand showed in research into causes, and he states that the apparent impartiality of narrative in the

[123] *Ibid.,* I, 36.

[124] *Ibid.,* I, 39.

[125] *Loc. cit.;* pp. 52 ff., 109 ff., 145. However, Chateaubriand did not evidence a lack of critical sense when in the case of discrepancies he followed Tillemont rather than Gibbon.

[126] *Loc. cit.* pp. 158, 176, 193.—The book of Dollinger deals mainly with the *Études historiques* proper, that is to say, with the section until the reign of Clovis; it thus disregards all the parts devoted to the history of France. For the complex plan of the *Études* cf. the preface pp. 91 ff. The different sections have received a highly unequal treatment. Space is lacking for a proper discussion of this topic.

Études was really indifference. Therefore, this pretended impartiality gave way immediately whenever a similarity between the character of the author and the personalities he presented made itself felt, as was the case with Gallienus and the Apostate who attempted to stem the tide of his age, or with "the melancholies of St. Jerome." "Le moi qui se cache est toujours présent," another French critic wrote.[127]

Dollinger summed up Chateaubriand as an historical writer: "He sees history; he does not explain it."[128] Granted all the insufficiencies of Chateaubriand's historical criticism of his sources, he knew how to make them speak as few have done. We may think of the entrance of Elagabalus into Rome or of the description of Alaric's funeral ending with the sentence, "To hide away forever the knowledge of such riches, together with the corpse the diggers are thrown into the grave." [129] "We are less concerned," Chateaubriand said, in presenting the age of the Apostate, "with the historical criticism of this epoch, than with the presentation of the movements of its thoughts." [130]

It is the method, the form that gives unity to the *Études;* the ideas expressed in the work may change; the views presented are not always consistent. A few basic ones, however, remain: the importance of Christianity and that of liberty, the latter most personally understood and impressed on the reader as individual independence, "that faith in independence that upsets all." [131] When Chateaubriand alluded to Gibbon's famous discussion of "the period in the history of the world during which the condition of the human race was most happy and prosperous," it was certainly not "without hesitation" that he subscribed to the statement of the British historian that the years from the death of Domitian to the accession of Commodus formed that epoch. One could say so, we read in the *Études,* if the dignity and the independence of nations were considered to form no part of their happiness.[132] Chateaubriand spoke of the early monasteries as nur-

[127] P. Moreau, *Chateaubriand* (Paris, 1927) p. 191.

[128] *loc. cit.* pp. 314 ff.

[129] *Etudes,* I, 217; III, 50 ff.

[130] *Ibid.,* II, 62.

[131] Cf. I, 110, 131, 133; IV, 230.

[132] *Ibid.,* I, 183. Gibbon, *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire,* ed J. B. Bury, I, 78.

series for . . . independence, and he wrote proudly that "independence was at the bottom of a barbarian." [133] Among those basic views of the *Études* we may perhaps also place a growing belief in human progress, an influence of the atmosphere leading to the days of July, 1830, and of such thinkers as Guizot. One can trace in certain sections of the *Études* the beginnings of trends that were to be called liberal Catholicism, as in the statement critical of Bossuet, that Christianity does not form a circle which is not to be enlarged, but one that widens as civilization advances.[134] "Christianity grows and marches with the ages: light, when it mingles with the faculties of the mind, feeling, when it associates with the movements of the soul; moderator of peoples and of kings, it opposes only the excess of power, wherever it may come".[135]

While some of the historical portraits of the *Études,* like that of Caesar, are built on over-pointed contrasts, it would be more fitting to speak in general of tensions than of contrasts in the historical studies written by a man whose personal life was loaded with tensions and who as early as the years of the *Génie* knew fully how to appreciate the importance of dissonances, those tensions in music. The feeling for the vague survives in the tensions which history presented: "I shall try to present to you those three different worlds which co-exist somewhat confusedly: the ancient, the Christian, and the barbarian world." [136] The grasping of the historic tensions is at the basis of all the statements stressing the diversity, the lack of uniformity in the world of history. "The Roman world did not offer a uniform aspect," but neither did feudal France [137] or the world of the Middle Ages: "Its population did not have that uniform aspect. . . ." [138] They all were filled with tensions. It is in sensing and portraying these that

[133] *Ibid.*, II, 272; III, 14.

[134] *Ibid.*, I, 139, 152. These trends too are usually found in the parts Chateaubriand wrote last: the preface, the exposition, and the section at the end.

[135] *Ibid.*, I, 149. But. cf. the remark that we witness in our days the fall of the institutions which the Apostate proscribed, II, 18.

[136] *Ibid.*, I, 151.

[137] *Ibid.*, I, 200; III, 167.

[138] *Ibid.*, III, 281.

Chateaubriand sweeps far above the characterizations of the medieval period which German Romantics like Novalis and Wackenroder offered, based on their longing for an all too sweet harmony.

Thus Chateaubriand depicted decaying Rome: "The same generation had as their masters within less than a quarter of a century an African, an Assyrian, and a Goth; and soon you will see an Arab arriving." [139] The atmosphere that filled that doomed world can hardly be rendered more impressively than in the sentence that sums up the survey of "the new world": with the barbarians massing still beyond the frontiers of the Empire: "It it as if the noise of their steps and the cries of those multitudes were already making the Capitol tremble." [140] The all-embracing, deep melancholy of the dying pagan world with its "presentiments of the future," the agony of a society destined to pass away, was not sensed in an equally impressive way until Burckhardt's *Age of Constantine* (1853). The pages in which Chateaubriand narrates the struggle between the old and the new ideas, certainly one of the greatest tensions history has ever known, belong to the most impressive in the *Études*. He presented them in their variety, not forgetting incidental attempts to bridge them, as in the letters exchanged between St. Basil and Libanius.[141] It is the late fourth century of which Chateaubriand speaks as the age of a natural peace that one might call the peace of talents. "There was much life in that age, because there was much death," [142] the great and final tension. "Do we know of anything more beautiful and at the same time more alike than those last utterances of Simplicius (in the Orient) and Boethius (in the Occident)? At that time Christianity was truly philosophic." But this Christian philosophy was still premature; it comes to its natural philosophic age only in our times.[143] Only the chapter on the manners of the late pagans markedly lacks such tensions, and no shades are introduced into the endless grey which envelops that description from beginning to end. But on the other hand, there is the

[139] *Ibid.*, I, 231.
[140] *Ibid.*, I, 248.
[141] *Ibid.*, II, 148 ff.
[142] *Ibid.*, II, 150.
[143] *Ibid.*, II, 157.

striking presentation of how the barbarians looked: "Such were our fathers."[144]

When discussing the Middle Ages, Chateaubriand moved far beyond the attitude taken in the *Génie*. Granted, again, that the elaboration of these parts of the *Études* is very unequal and sometimes sketchy to an incredible degree, granted that the historical publications of Thierry, Barante, and Villemain[145] were especially helpful for them, as was also the appearance of a work like the *Gallia Christiana*, nevertheless there is a great underlying unity in Chateaubriand's presentation of the Middle Ages. Again he took delight in depicting the diversity of the trends at work during that period; he perceived chivalry taking shape from the sentimental fidelity of the Teutons and from a marvelous gallantry of the Moors under the spell of Christianity.[146] While writers like Turgot had been at pains to perceive some single genius arise in the Middle Ages, Chateaubriand spoke of the dark ages as "a fertile night, a powerful chaos bearing in its womb a new universe." Unlike the German Romantics, Chateaubriand did not close his eyes to the unpleasant aspects presented by that period. He stressed the tensions existing in a society built upon the remains of many earlier ones.[147] But even when the medieval centuries imitated and followed, that age was full of vitality and strength. He thought that much of recent French art was insincere copying: "It was not in that vein that the Middle Ages imitated . . . these ages always remained masters themselves."[148] The description, the evaluation of Gothic architecture in the *Études* is always based on the author's experiences. He had relived the past more powerfully than in the years when he wrote the *Génie*. How intensely did he now enjoy the variety expressed in that art, its mingling of the tragic and the buffoonish, of the gigantic and the gracious! "Inwardly, a cathedral was a forest. . . . The monuments of our days have been lowered and levelled, like our social ranks. . . ."[149]

[144] *Ibid.*, III, 9.

[145] Abel-François, Villemain was the author of *Tableau du XVIIIe siècle* and of *Littérature du moyen âge*. E. Fueter, *loc. cit.*, 430 ff.

[146] *Ibid.*, III, 243.

[147] *Ibid.*, III, 257, 296 ff.

[148] *Ibid.*, III, 270 ff.

[149] *Ibid.*, III, 277, 279.

We are wretched people in comparison with those barbarians of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.[150] That was the time of the marvelous in every sphere." Now he has words of highest praise for the achievements of Thomas Aquinas.[151] The climax is in the revealing exclamation: "Never has the individual lived so much;" "jamais l'individu n'a tant vécu."[152]

According to the pattern developed in French historical writing from Boulainvilliers and Montesquieu down to Thierry and Guizot, Chateaubriand was mainly concerned with tracing the inner history of the Roman and the French nations. The topic conspicuous in the contemporary German school, the history of the struggle for power of the great nations, is practically non-existent in the *Études*, just as it was absent from the *Essai* and the *Génie*. The *Études* present an impressive example of "Romantic" conception, in as much as while they indulge in masterful elaborations of cherished episodes, the sense of the architectonic structure of the whole is lacking. One is tempted to say it is due to their very nature that they were never completed.

The section of the *Études* dealing with recent French history belongs to the least elaborated parts of the work and apparently, like the preface, was written last. Frequent references are made here to the vague theory of the three truths, the interaction of which constitute the realm of history according to the aspect exposed in the preface, and the expression of the author's belief in progress achieved in history appears more frequently in this section than elsewhere. A statement like the following has been given much of the Enlightenment color: "In certain general respects we, men of our century, are better, or rather, our times are better than the men or the ages that preceded us; and this can be explained simply by the progress that reason and civilization have achieved."[153] This sentence sounds like the antithesis to that of Ranke that in history "each period is immediate to God." But Chateaubriand is not very strict, when faced with concrete cases, in carrying out such a principle. Even the concept of

[150] *Ibid.*, III, 285.
[151] *Ibid.*, III, 293, 258.
[152] *Ibid.*, III, 299.
[153] *Ibid.*, IV, 327.

the prevalence of the "Grand Siècle" is gone: "The century of the arts in France extends from Francis I to Louis XIII, and in nowise is it the century of Louis XIV."[154] It is the XVIth, not the XVIIth. And it is in this section that an evaluation of Gothic architecture is found, according to which it effaces by its grandeur the monuments of the Greeks." [155] One of the basic intentions of Chateaubriand's last historical work was to stress the greatness of the past—"force est de reconnaître cette grandeur du passé" [156]—while presenting with a growing emphasis a belief in progress to be prceived in history.

In the last section of the *Études,* similar to other statements made by him around 1830, Chateaubriand speaks of the growing trends which will rearrange—*recomposer*—a catholic unity; "Christian religion enters a new era; in order to shine forth with a new brightness, Christianity waits only for a superior genius to appear at his proper time." [157] Again we see Chateaubriand taking a path in these years that might lead close to liberal Catholicism.

Much of the last section, and even the turning points of French history are described in a very sketchy way. The reader when recalling what the author of the *Études* had written on the physiognomy of the ages, and that he had almost discovered the spell of the vague in historical presentation, is at pains how to explain a sentence like that which speaks of the calamities of a hundred years' duration as the effect of a moment's inspiration.[158] Had he so completely forgotten Bossuet's admonition to the historian to watch carefully for the hidden dispositions which prepare great changes? and Burke's and the Romantics' care for tracing a slow unconscious growth in history? If the task of the historian is to be thought of precisely as reliving the past in an especially intensive way, Chateaubriand was singularly deficient in the last section of the *Études.* What is the use—the reader may feel—

[154] *Ibid.,* IV, 293; cf. also the Préface I, 112.

[155] *Ibid.,* IV, 186.

[156] *Ibid.,* III, 124.

[157] *Ibid.,* IV, 192. A passage referring to the possibility of re-establishing a Catholic unity in the near future, also II, 161 ff., at the end of the third "Discours." Perhaps the last paragraphs present a late addition of the author. Cf. I, 95, Préface: "La papauté abdiquera (in our age) naturellement les fonctions temporelles."

[158] *Ibid.,* IV, 6.

of his having gone through the contemporary pamphlets to which he refers, if it did not help him to relive the periods of the religious wars more intensively?

The characterisation Chateaubriand gives of Protestantism starts in an interesting way with a parallel between Catholic and Protestant morality; emphasis is given to the importance of the faculties of imagination within Catholicism. However, it soon becomes evident that the author thinks mainly of Calvinism in referring to Protestantism, as for instance, when he stresses the aristocratic basis of its political thought. It is really strange to read in a work published five years before Tocqueville's analysis of America's religious trends as presented in the first volume of his *Democracy in America,* the statements of Chateaubriand why Protestantism failed by necessity in republican countries,[159] and it is equally strange to learn that the basically republican character of Belgium was brought to realisation by Catholic priests.[160]

In a well-known passage of the *Discourse on Universal History* Bossuet wrote: "With the exception of certain extraordinary strokes where God willed that His hand alone should become manifest, there has occurred in history no great change that did not have its cause in preceding centuries". We may finally ask: What was Chateaubriand's concept of the work of Divine Providence in history? Again, we shall find a theoretical consideration given to this problem mostly in the last section of the *Études;* but concrete answers are spread throughout all its parts. There are those moments when allusion is made to the hidden leadership of Divine Providence in a purposely vague and indistinctive way that, nevertheless, makes the reader sense and become aware that the atmosphere is filled with hidden forces, as in the description of the barbarians marching towards Rome: "A miraculous instinct drives them on. . . . they have heard from above that they are called up from north and south, from west and east. . . . While they do not know whence they come, they know whither they go: they march on to the Capitol, summoned, they say, to the destruction of the Roman Empire as to a banquet." [161] Or con-

[159] *Ibid.*, IV, 188; cf. 190: "la république plébeienne des États Unis."
[160] *Ibid.*, IV, 191.
[161] *Ibid.*, I, 141.

sider the reference made to that force (*quelque chose*) that seemed to push the Apostate towards the battle which was to prove fatal to him.[162] But often Chateaubriand prefers to make definite statements. He speaks of Attila as being stopped by the hand of God;[163] he is confident that while God permits the accomplishment of general revolutions. He punishes the injustice of individuals in the course of history.[164] He speaks of the valet, Gobin-Agace, who was to betray the French in the battle of Crécy, as one of those men of perdition whom Providence uses when it wants to punish empires.[165] Following in the wake of De Maistre, Chateaubriand conceives of the executioners of divine wrath endowed with only mediocre abilities: But even "their mistakes serve to increase their power . . . they march over the earth like drunkards, driven by God who makes them strong and whom they deny."[166] The reader feels the influence of Bossuet when the *Études* refer to "those long revenges which belong to God alone."[167]

It seems, however—and especially in the last section of the *Études*—as if Chateaubriand sometimes were loath to suspend his judgment, as if he wished to pronounce definitely when the reader would expect the historian to refrain from a direct statement and refer to possibility only. In such instances the great French writer, who as man became a pattern to his generation comparable only to Goethe and Lord Byron in this respect, seemed unwilling—or unable—to make any sacrifice in the realm of historical writing. But however unsatisfactory long sections of the *Études historiques* may be found, they bear, in those parts in which their author succeeded, impressive witness to a man who was congenial with those ages of which he had written: "Never has the individual lived so much," "jamais l'individu n'a tant vécu."[168]

The Catholic University of America

[162] *Ibid.*, II, 56 ff.
[163] *Ibid.*, II, 208
[164] *Ibid.*, II, 128; in a similar way IV, 103.
[165] *Ibid.*, IV, 25.
[166] *Ibid.*, IV, 102 ff.
[167] *Ibid.*, IV, 39.
[168] *Ibid.*, III, 299.

THE CLOSING OF THE AMERICAN DIPLOMATIC MISSION TO THE VATICAN AND EFFORTS TO REVIVE IT, 1868-1870

By

Howard R. Marraro*

Toward the middle of January, 1867, the American people were shocked to read a widely circulated report in the press[1] to the effect that the papal authorities had ordered the Scotch Protestant Chapel in Rome to conduct its religious services outside the walls of the city and that the ceremonies in the American chapel were to be stopped entirely. This announcement, of course, aroused the indignation of non-Catholic Americans and the press gave vent to this feeling.[2]

The Providence (Rhode Island) *Daily Journal*[3] felt that there were reasons, personal or diplomatic, why Mr. Rufus King,[4] the American minister, could not hold fast to a privilege which had been granted ever since the United States had a minister at the Holy See.[5] In the opinion of this newspaper it was unfortunate that he had allowed the Roman government to place him in a position where he had to retreat from a ground so long held, and one which was "so repugnant" to

* Mr. Marraro is associate professor of Italian in Columbia University.

[1] New York *Herald*, January 12, 1867; Boston *Daily Evening Transcript*, January 16, 1867; New York *Observer*, January 17, 1867; Philadelphia *Press*, January 18, 1867; New Bern (North Carolina) *Journal of Commerce*, January 24, 27, 1867.

[2] Sister Loretta Clare Feiertag in her *American Public Opinion on the Diplomatic Relations between the United States and the Papal States, 1847-1867* (Washington, 1933) devotes a chapter (pp. 144-171) to the question of "Formal Diplomatic Relations Discontinued by the United States." The reader is referred to this chapter for a comprehensive account of the question. It is the object of this article to give additional information based on further research on the subject.

[3] January 17, 1867.

[4] Rufus King (1814-1876) was minister to Rome from 1863 to 1868. Cf. the biographical sketch by his son, General Charles King, in *Wisconsin Magazine of History*, IV (June, 1921), 371-381; *Dictionary of American Biography*, X, 400.

[5] Following the liberal reforms of Pope Pius IX after his election in June, 1846, the American Congress voted to establish diplomatic relations with the Papal States and these were maintained from 1848 to 1868.

American ideas and pride to yield. After comparing the full freedom which the Catholic Church enjoyed in the United States with the restrictions imposed on religious worship in Rome, the *Daily Journal* concluded that such proceedings as those in Rome "did not conciliate the opinion of civilized nations and made the prospects of its extinction most welcome to Americans."

To the New York *Times*[6] the report hardly seemed real. It likewise seemed unreal to this newspaper that powerful liberal nations like Great Britain and the United States, whose governments extended to the spiritual subjects of Rome the utmost toleration and treated them with every consideration and respect, should have indignities offered to them by a "feeble, corrupt, dying remnant of despotic rulership—the very caricature and ghostly counterfeit of impotent tyranny with its paralytic army of petticoated priests." The *Times* reminded its readers that the American Protestant clergy did not go to Rome to make converts of the Romans but to edify people of their own language and faith who had made Rome a temporary residence. Reproaching the American government for its failure to assert a right that was recognized by all rules of international comity, the *Times* felt humiliated to read that the American representative had been obliged to "slink" outside of the walls of Rome, along with his fellow-countrymen and fellow-religionists, "like so many conspirators," before they could read the *Book of Common Prayer* or open the *New Testament*, as a worshipping congregation, while in the United States, on every hand there arose "gorgeous" Roman Catholic edifices, "surrounded with all the appendages and endowments of a recognized Romish hierarchy." The *Times* concluded that the report hardly admitted of reasoning, and that it was one of unsparing and unqualified denunciation.

As if this language were not strong enough, two days later in another editorial, the New York *Times*[7] insisted that it was about time that "this Roman nonsense" of driving Protestant worshippers into "the stinking suburbs" of Rome should be stopped. Since the world had outgrown the influence of priestly curses, "the Church

[6] January 25, 1867.
[7] January 27, 1867.

dignitaries could continue to blast away at American clergymen with their impotent anathemas." But, the *Times* warned, Americans would not tolerate the insults the Roman authorities chose "to fling at American religion," for this compromised the rights and the dignity which they were bound to uphold as American citizens.

Meanwhile, the report had been so widespread and the indignation so general that it attracted the attention of Congress. On January 24, 1867, Representative William E. Dodge, a Republican of New York, introduced a resolution requesting the President of the United States to communicate to the House of Representatives any information which the government might have received concerning the removal of the Protestant Church at the American embassy from the city of Rome by order of the papal government. On January 29, 1867, Secretary of State William H. Seward replied that his department had received no information concerning the subject inquired of in the resolution.[8]

However, since at that moment the House of Representatives had under consideration the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, Representative Thomas Williams, a Republican of Pennsylvania, moved to strike from the civil and diplomatic appropriation bill the item providing for the salary of the American minister at Rome, explaining that there was no sufficient reason why the American government should continue to maintain diplomatic relations with a "foreign hierarchy." Thaddeus Stevens, Republican, of Pennsylvania, moved to add, as a reason for so doing, a protest against the recent denial in that city of the right to worship God according to the dictates of the consciences of American Protestants. However, Stevens' amendment was practically defeated, the preamble being struck out by a vote of 65 to 32.[9] Messrs. Robert C. Schenck, Republican, from

[8] United States House of Representatives: 39th Congress; 2nd session. *Protestant Church at Rome: Message from the President of the United States in answer to a Resolution of the House of the 24th instant, relative to the removal of the Protestant Church at the American Embassy from the city of Rome by order of the Government.* January 29, 1867. House Executive Document No. 57 (Washington, 1867). For biographical sketches of the congressmen and senators mentioned in this article, cf. *Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1927* (Washington, 1928).

[9] New York *Daily Tribune*, January 30, 1867.

Ohio, Justin S. Morrill, Republican, from Vermont, also spoke in favor of abolishing the mission, while William E. Finck, Democrat, of Ohio, John W. Chanler, Democrat, of New York, Nathaniel P. Banks, Democrat, of Massachusetts, John Bidwell, Unionist, from California, fought the motion.

The amendment to abolish the mission to Rome created a good deal of discussion in the public press. The Washington correspondent of the New York *Daily Tribune*[10] reported that Mr. Chanler had made "a howling speech" in which he had admitted that although he was a Protestant he represented a Catholic district and, therefore, was opposed to abolishing the mission. Nevertheless, as the correspondent[11] pointed out in another communication, the debate "proved that there was an ill-concealed hostility to the Roman Catholic Church pervading the minds of the majority of the House."

Referring to Stevens' amendment, the New York *Daily Tribune*[12] expressed the "earnest hope" that the appropriation would not be made and that the mission would be promptly and forever discontinued. However, the newspaper rejoiced that the preamble was stricken out, for the reason therein assigned, though cogent, did not cover the whole ground. Rome, in the opinion of the editor, was an ecclesiastical capital, and the American government had properly nothing to do with ecclesiastical matters. The Italian people desired to be one nation with Rome for its capital; and Rome, by a vast majority of its people, desired to be that capital. The papal government existed there in defiance of the people of Rome as well as of Italy, being upheld by the threats of foreign intervention.[13] The keeping of an American minister at Rome tended to uphold the despotic papal power; wherefore, the *Daily Tribune* insisted that the American minister be withdrawn. Although "certain Americans" recognized the Bishop of Rome as their spiritual head on earth, the *Daily Tribune* thought that this was their own affair with which the American government had

[10] January 30, 1867.

[11] New York *Herald*, January 31, 1867

[12] January 30, 1867.

[13] After defeating Garibaldi and Mazzini in 1849, and crushing the Roman Republic, the French army remained in Rome, except for a brief interval, to 1870 in order to protect the Pope in his temporal rule.

nothing to do. However, the rule of that bishop over one million or so Italians, in defiance of their "notorious wishes," was a very different matter and was not to be countenanced by this or by any other republic. The *Daily Tribune* concluded that it was proper to "render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's," but warned against mixing "our theology with our politics."

The Catholic press approved the action of the papal government. The New York *Freeman's Journal and Catholic Register* defended and applauded the expulsion of Protestant worship from Rome on the assumption that Rome was exclusively and peculiarly a Catholic city. It asked:

> What right have I to go into the largest conventicle of any of the paltry Protestant sects in their country to disturb their worship? . . . As the Pope and the Catholic religion, and nothing else, have kept Rome from being an uninhabited desert, the nearly three hundred millions of Catholics in the world have a right to claim for that, as a holy city, in some ways, an exception from the rest of the world![14]

In reply to the above statement, the New York *Daily Tribune*[15] admitted that it did not care to know whether all this was very well or very ill since it added to the demonstration that the American government had no business for a minister there and that Mr. King should be called home. "Ours," said the *Daily Tribune,* "is a secular government and has nothing to do with ecclesiastically holy cities. Let the dead bury the dead. If our Roman Catholics want a representative at Rome, they are at perfect liberty to send one."

The New York *Freeman's Journal*[16] warned its readers that since the Atlantic cable was well known for "the good deal of trash" it transmitted daily, they should not pay any attention to the great "hubbub" the report had aroused. Although the Catholic paper did not know whether there was any truth in the report, still it knew that the preaching places had been reported as nests of political propagandism and with its experience of Protestant preaching, how could any one suppose a preacher to keep his "little auditory awake, without some violent political diatribes?"

[14] Quoted in New York *Daily Tribune,* February 1, 1867.

[15] February 1, 1867.

[16] February 2, 1867.

When it became known that Congress had taken definite action to terminate the mission to Rome there was general approval in the American press. Declaring that the maintenance of Protestantism throughout the world did not depend in any degree on America's being permitted to read the *Westminster Confession* or the *Book of Common Prayer* within the walls of Rome, the New York *Times*[17] approved the action of Congress because as Americans were liberal and were generally people of good nature, it was "silly" for Rome to propose "a revival of the Inquisition."

However, the New York *Herald*[18] expressed its regret that the diplomatic mission to Rome had been abolished, chiefly because it found that Rome was a genial and pleasant place for literary gentlemen of ease and leisure to study antiquities in the absence of any special diplomatic duty which, however, was never of any great moment; and at a time when the temporal sovereignty of the Holy Father was almost at its lowest ebb, the post became a matter of mere insignificance. The *Herald* believed that the impeachment and attempted removal of President Johnson by a grand coup d'etat was a task of the first magnitude for Congress and, therefore, it should not have had to descend to such "trifles" as the suppression of the mission to Rome. In the magnitude of its present duties, the *Herald* concluded, Congress could well have afforded to let "the poor Pope" alone.

Even the *Freeman's Journal*[19] was now glad to note that the "Rump Congress" had abolished the mission to Rome. The newspaper thought it absurd for a government that professed to have no power to deal with religious questions to pay ten or twelve thousand dollars a year for the support of an embassy at a court that, except as religious and Catholic, amounted to nothing, adding that a consul was all that the American government needed in Rome. The maintenance of a minister there, in the opinion of the Catholic paper, was a waste of public money, for the benefit of such travelling absentee landlords of America as found it cheaper to live in monarchical Europe than in the tax-laden

[17] February 2, 1867.
[18] February 2, 1867.
[19] February 9, 1867.

United States and who happened to visit Rome with nothing to recommend them but the gold they drew from these states to spend in Europe. Besides, the *Freeman's Journal* had always regarded that mission as a seed pregnant with future evils since the mission was offensive both to Protestants who looked on it as intended to be a special compliment to Catholics and to reflecting Catholics who foresaw the bad uses to which it could be put.

As soon as the report reached Rome that Congress had voted to discontinue the mission, American correspondents in the Eternal City sent despatches to their respective newspapers in which they tried to correct the false reports about the removal of the American Protestant Church outside the walls of Rome. The Rome correspondent of the New York *Herald*,[20] in a despatch dated February 7, 1867, suggested that the closing of the Presbyterian places of worship in Rome may have produced an anti-papal feeling in the House of Representatives. He warned, however, that if the mission was definitely and finally abolished, the American Episcopalian congregation, having no longer the protection of the United States flag, would have to follow the example of the Scotch Presbyterians and migrate beyond the walls of the Protestant colony outside the Porta del Popolo.

In another despatch, dated Rome, February 21, 1867, the same correspondent[21] stated that the Americans in Rome were surprised and indignant with the news that the legation was suppressed, especially because they were informed that the occasion had been taken to accuse the Roman government of unfriendliness, when as a matter of fact it had extended an act of courtesy to King, the minister. The correspondent explained that on account of the difficulty of finding in Rome an apartment with suitable accommodations for the chapel, owing to the increase of American travellers, Cardinal Antonelli, the papal Secretary of State, had signified to General King that he could separate the chapel from the legation by placing it in the room occupied for some thirty years by the English congregation, and adjoining the then present English chapel. The correspondent considered this as an act of courtesy on the part of the Roman government, as the Roman laws

[20] February 28, 1867.

[21] New York *Herald*, March 14, 1867.

required Protestant worship to be held at the residence of the representatives of Protestant countries and General King's predecessors had not been able to obtain this favor. Without entering into a discussion of the issue of tolerance or intolerance, the correspondent recalled that the Roman government was a theocracy and by giving free worship to all the different Protestant sects "it would stultify itself." While on this subject, he reminded his readers that Sweden and Denmark permitted no places of worship but their national church and non-Lutheran Protestants as well as Catholics had no places of free worship in those countries.

A similar explanation was given by the Florence correspondent of the New York *Times*[22] who, in a letter dated from that city on February 19, 1867, stated that the Roman government, desirous of taking a liberal view of its law regulating Protestant worship, had not wished to interfere with American Protestant worship. Now, he stressed, if Congress, acting hastily on imperfect information, had abolished the legation, Americans had simply "cut off their own noses."

Meanwhile, the Secretary of State received a despatch of February 11, 1867, from Mr. King, in which he referred to the newspaper reports to the effect that the American chapel had been removed outside of the walls of Rome by direction of the papal authorities; and that the American minister, assenting to the arrangement, had hired a villa where the services were henceforth to be held. The American minister emphatically denied that there was any truth to the published reports. "The American Protestant Church in Rome," wrote Mr. King, "remains where it was located at the commencement of the season and will not, I think, be interfered with, for the present, at any rate."[23]

Two weeks later, on March 14, 1867, President Johnson transmitted to the House of Representatives another despatch which the

[22] March 11, 1867.

[23] On March 2, 1867, the President of the United States transmitted a message, embodying the text of this letter, with enclosures, to the House of Representatives, in reply to the resolution of Congress of January 24. United States House of Representatives: 39th Congress; 2nd session. *Protestant Church at Rome. Message from the President of the United States in answer to a resolution of the House of January 24 last.* House Executive Document 115. March 2, 1867 (Washington, 1867).

Secretary of State had received from General King.[24] This despatch, dated Rome, February 18, 1867, contained a detailed statement of the situation. King explained that the laws of Rome did not tolerate any other form of public religious worship than such as conformed to the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church; but the right of any foreign minister at the papal court to hold religious services under his own roof and in accordance with the forms of his national or individual faith had never been questioned or interfered with. Thus the Russian, the Prussian, the American and other representatives of foreign powers in Rome had always exercised and, even then, enjoyed unmolested the freedom of religious worship in the several chapels connected with their respective legations. These chapels, of course, were open to all compatriots of the different ministers desirous of joining in their religious services. Referring more specifically to the question of American Protestant worship, King declared that so long as the number of Americans visiting Rome was comparatively small, it was not difficult for the minister in securing apartments for himself and family to make suitable provision, also, for a chapel. But in recent years, with the very great increase of travel, this had been no easy matter. It had not infrequently occurred, according to King, that the congregation worshipping under the minister's roof had reached the number of 250 or 300, and more than once it had been much larger than could be accommodated in the apartments provided. These, of course, once set apart and suitably furnished for religious worship, could be used for no other purpose, and hence it had followed that the largest and best room in the minister's residence was practically inaccessible to him except on Sundays and holidays. Therefore, the vestry of Grace Church, under whose auspices the services were conducted, desired to hire an apartment themselves, separate from the legation where they could hold religious services, confident in the belief that they would not be interfered with by the

[24] United States House of Representatives: 40th Congress; 1st session. 1867. *Protestant Church at Rome: Message from the President of the United States communicating additional information in answer to a Resolution of the House of the 24th of January last, relative to the removal of the American Protestant Church from the City of Rome.* House Executive Document No. 6 (Washington, 1867).

local authorities. Rooms were accordingly procured, fitted, and furnished in the Vicolo d'Alibert, a central and convenient locality and there, since early in November, Americans had assembled for public worship and still continued to assemble "without let or hindrance." However, to prevent if possible a step which King knew would excite a great deal of feeling at Rome and subject Americans there to much annoyance and inconvenience, and, at the same time, "to give ourselves at least the colour of right to assemble where we did for religious worship," he directed the arms of the American legation to be placed over the building in which the American chapel was located. This seemed to have satisfied the requirements or scruples of the authorities, and up to the date of his letter no one had interfered with Americans; nor did King believe that they would be disturbed during that season.

On March 11, 1867, Seward, in a brief official note, informed the American minister at Rome that in the "act making appropriation for the consular and diplomatic expenses of the Government for the year ending 30th of June, 1868, and for other purposes," approved February 28, 1867, it was provided that "no money hereby or otherwise appropriated shall be paid for the purpose of an American Legation at Rome, from and after the thirtieth day of June, eighteen hundred and sixty-seven."[25]

In acknowledging the receipt of this communication in a despatch, dated Rome, May 7, 1867, which was transmitted to the House of Representatives,[26] King stated that the intelligence of the closing of the American mission had elicited very strong expressions of regret from the American artists resident in Rome and transient American visitors there, as well as from his colleagues of the diplomatic corps and various functionaries of the papal court. King added that the Pope himself felt hurt by "this hasty and apparently groundless action

[25] Leo F. Stock, *United States Ministers to the Papal States* (Washington, 1933), p. 423.

[26] United States—House of Representatives. *Executive Document No. 1—Message of the President of the United States and accompanying documents to the two Houses of Congress at the Commencement of the Second Session of the 40th Congress.* Part I (Washington, 1868). King's despatch is also in Stock, *op. cit.*, pp. 427-428.

of Congress," and thought it an unkind and ungenerous return for the good will he had always manifested towards the American government and people. The feeling was widespread, Mr. King emphasized, that it was not His Holiness the Pope, but the American Congress who, by closing the mission there, had driven the American Protestant worship outside the gates of Rome. It owed its suppression in Rome to the suppression of the American legation, to Congress and not to the Pope. King felt that this fact rendered it all the more difficult for him to announce to Pius IX that the United States had determined to withdraw its representative at the papal court, and to break off all diplomatic intercourse with the papal government "on the alleged but erroneous grounds that the Pope refused to permit Protestant worship within the walls of Rome."

However, Rufus King's explanation failed to satisfy the American press. The New York *Times*[27] did not see that this explanation altered the situation any, for in its opinion the American chapel was not, even then, allowed to exist within the city of Rome. The theory of diplomatic intercourse provided, the *Times* explained, that the building over which the flag of a foreign power was placed was, for the time being, a portion of the dominion of that power; and so far, therefore, from the worship of Americans under the flag of the legation being performed upon sufferance, it was performed as a clear matter of international right. We had, therefore, nothing to thank the papal government for in this matter, however the case may have stood if the presence of the flag had been conceded as unnecessary. The New York *Times* urged American Protestants not to think that they had been favored by the concession of what they claimed as a right. Nor did the *Times* view the termination of the affair as an indication of more liberal ideas on the part of the government at Rome, for those who had no diplomatic representative in the city, but who happened nevertheless to be Protestant Christians, had to go outside the walls of Rome when they would join as a congregation in prayer, while those whose governments were accredited at the papal court were only permitted to meet at their legation for the same purpose, because that court had no choice on the subject,

[27] March 12, 1867.

and because the worship became in effect private instead of public. Rome, as of yore, the *Times* warned, conceded only what she was forced to.

When rumors began to circulate that Congress, in the light of the evidence submitted by Mr. King, was contemplating a reversal of its action, the New York *Tribune* remonstrated. While not endorsing other statements made by the *Tribune*, the New York *Freeman's Journal*[28] agreed with it in regard to the ruling fact that Rome was of no political consequence, except as an ecclesiastical power, and that, with such a power, the United States had no business to meddle diplomatically. The *Freeman's Journal* believed that in time, if the mission was continued, it could not fail to be a serious embarrassment to Catholic interests in the United States, because ever since the mission was first established, Catholic bishops had been pestered by obsequious place-hunters, begging these bishops to recommend them for various offices. If the situation continued it would inevitably give rise to "court bishops" who would, at least, divide their attention to the flocks over which the Holy Ghost had made them bishops, with a care for political concernments. The undue influence and pressure that one such bishop, with his friend, a professed Catholic, perhaps, as American minister at Rome, might exert in matters where Church and State should be apart was a danger that it was well to scent afar off and to prevent, according to the Catholic paper. There were no relations between Rome and the United States that a consul could not attend to, except such as were ecclesiastical, and these should be left untramelled and uninfluenced between the court of Rome and the proper ecclesiastical authorities of the United States. The "infamous radical rump Congress," concluded the *Freeman's Journal*, acting on a lie about the interference with American Protestant worship, which never happened, had suppressed the legation in Rome. The professed motive was hostility to the Catholic Church. As it wished this Congress to be loathed and hated for all time, the *Freeman's Journal* wanted this "silly action," on a false rumor, to stand unrepealed.

William Cullen Bryant, the poet and editor, who was travelling in

[28] March 23, 1867.

Europe while this question was being debated, wrote a letter from Vienna, on April 12, 1867,[29] in which he expressed the belief that the supposed slight upon Americans in regard to Protestant worship had been fully explained. The papal government, "among other vices which belong to its nature," had that of religious intolerance and this, Bryant thought, would inhere in its very constitution until the papacy as a civil power was overthrown. Americans could not expect it to change its nature on account of regard to their government, although there was every reason to believe that those by whom it was administered wished to stand well with the United States; and as long as they were no more rigid in enforcing their rules against Americans than against others, Americans had all that they could fairly expect, and if they wanted anything better they had to wait till Rome formed a part of "the great Italian Kingdom."

In the act of Congress making appropriations for the consular and diplomatic expenses of the government for the year ending June 30, 1868, it was specifically stated that "no money hereby or otherwise appropriated shall be paid for the support of an American Legation at Rome from and after the thirtieth day of June, eighteen hundred and sixty-seven."[30] Accordingly a cable from Rome on August 20, 1867, stated that the American mission to the Holy See having been discontinued, the American legation had been closed.[31]

Two attempts were made by several members of Congress in 1869 and again in 1870 to re-establish diplomatic relations between the United States and the Holy See. On January 6, 1869, a debate took place in the House of Representatives on the question of the mission to Rome when James Brooks, Democrat, of New York, asked Elihu B. Washburne, a Whig, of Illinois, chairman of the Appropriation Committee, why the amount of money appropriated for the consular and diplomatic expenses had been reduced by $7,025. The reply was that Rome, which had originally been included, was left out. Thereupon Brooks moved once more, with a view of arresting the attention of the House, now free, he trusted, from "all religious

[29] New York *Evening Post*, May 4, 1867.

[30] United States *Congressional Globe*, 39th Congress, 2nd session, 1866-1867. Appendix, pp. 192-193.

[31] New York *Herald*, August 21, 1867.

prejudice," that the mission to Rome be inserted and the usual appropriation of $7,500 be made therefore. Brooks pressed the matter on the ground that Rome was the headquarters of a large portion of not only the religious, but also of the artistic world. American citizens went there, he said, not only for a religious purpose but also to study the great works of art. He hoped, therefore, that the House would make the appropriation for this mission to Rome which it had made heretofore and that the proposition would have the approval of all, for it was much more important than the missions to San Salvador and Nicaragua; he did not see why the United States maintained missions to these small South American republics and abolished the mission to Rome.

Thereupon a spirited discussion followed. John Covode, a Republican, of Pennsylvania, and George W. Woodward, a Democrat, also of Pennsylvania, argued over the part played by the Catholics in the recent elections in their state; the former spoke against the Catholics, the latter in their favor. Norman B. Judd, a Republican, of Illinois, who was going to vote against Brooks' amendment, desired to place himself on record so that no side issue, either of religion or politics, should be charged as the motive for his action. He did not think that the issue between Covode and Woodward would govern the members of the House in deciding upon this question. He argued that the mission to Rome was not then in existence and the adoption of the amendment would revive it. With him, it was not a question of religion or religious tolerance or a question of politics, but it was rather whether there was any usefulness to the country in reviving this mission or continuing it. Since the territory of the papal government had become so limited there was no public necessity for a minister residing at that court. He did not know of any national interest that a diplomatic representative had to guard or keep watch on or call for the exercise of the powers of such a mission. He thought it was purely an "ornamental position" to be dealt out "to some pleasant gentleman with good political antecedents and a favorite of the powers that be." A consulate at Rome with a salary of $1,500 was continued by this bill; and for all of America's interests that might center there, there was nothing that had to be done at Rome by an official of the government that could not be done by a consul. If America

desired to act upon the principle of economy and cut off useless expenditures destroying merely ornamental positions, it might as well begin with the diplomatic service as with any other. Judd reminded his listeners that the Pope had never reciprocated the civility of the United States by sending a minister to this country. It had always been a one-sided affair, he said. Besides, he concluded, ever since Italy became consolidated substantially under Victor Emmanuel II this mission to Rome had been a "sinecure" and, to a certain extent, a "thorn" in the side of the "great nation of Italy," which was on friendly terms with the United States. The question was then taken upon the amendment proposed by Brooks; and the result was ayes thirty-one, noes eighty-two.[32]

The second and final effort to re-open the United States mission at Rome led to one of the most exciting scenes that had occurred in the House of Representatives for many years. The question arose on May 19, 1870, when the House took up the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill in the Committee of the Whole.[33] A tumult suddenly occurred when Brooks arose for the purpose of moving his annual amendment to this bill. He moved to strike out the appropriation for a minister to Guatemala and to insert Rome. This motion was lost by a vote of forty-seven to seventy-one. Nevertheless, the motion gave rise to a heated discussion which took in the *Syllabus,* Know-Nothingism, the hanging of Mrs. Surratt, Massachusetts' witches and convent burners—all of which almost broke up the committee in an uproar. Samuel S. Cox, a Democrat of New York, was not willing to let the opportunity pass for him to make capital with the people whose Church he so bitterly denounced in his book *A Buckeye Abroad: or Wanderings in Europe and the Orient* (New York, 1852). In his speech attacking Turkey and lauding Rome and the Catholic Church, Cox said in part:

Gentlemen are willing to send our nation to Turkey to make its salaam before the sultan and yet they will not send a minister to Rome, the mother

---

[32] *Congressional Globe,* January 6, 1869, 40th Congress, 3rd session, XL, Pt. I, 218-220. Also reported in the New York *World,* January 10, 1869 and Cincinnati *Daily Gazette,* January 7, 1869.

[33] *Congressional Globe,* May 19, 1870, 41st Congress, 2nd session, XLII, Pt. IV, 3628 ff.; New York *World,* May 21, 1870.

of Christianity and the mother also of art, science and literature—the representative of all that is noble in the past and of all that is great in the ideas we have today growing out of the Christianity which we revere.

These remarks brought John Armour Bingham, Republican of Ohio, to his feet. He opposed a mission to Rome and denounced the Pope's assumption of infallibility as opposed to the free and enlightened spirit of the age. The trouble began by a vulgar imputation of motives against the mover of the amendment, as if he were practising the trick of a demagogue to catch the votes of his Catholic constituents.

By this time the House had become greatly excited. Brooks, of New York, and Daniel W. Voorhees, a Democrat of Indiana, made violent speeches, attacking New England, charging that the objection to establishing a mission at Rome came from the Republican Party as a party and that the opposition to Catholics was as much a plank in the platform of that party as was the recognition of the Negro to vote. Henry L. Dawes, Republican, and George F. Hoar, Republican, both of Massachusetts, and Godlove S. Orth, a Republican, of Indiana, attacked what they called the demagogueism of Voorhees. Thereupon the latter lost his temper and began calling his colleagues liars. His language gave rise to uproarious disorder, and at one time at least, according to the newspaper reports, half of the members were on their feet screaming and yelling. For many minutes it was utterly impossible for Elbon C. Ingersoll, Republican of Illinois, to secure order, the House having become "a perfect mob." Finally, a motion that the committee rise was declared carried, and the House adjourned, thus bringing to an end what was generally regarded as one of the most disgraceful scenes that had ever been witnessed in the American Congress.[34]

The newspapers had much to say about the excitement in Congress. The *Daily Tribune*[35] described the scene as "simply disgraceful demagoguery," adding that when a single shot from Mr. Hoar pierced the armor of the demagogues, there ensued an explosion, charges of falsehood and the like, in the midst of which the scene ended. In the

[34] *Congressional Globe*, May 19, 1870, 2nd session, 41st Congress, XLII, Pt. IV, 3628 ff.; New York *Journal of Commerce*, May 20, 1870.

[35] New York *Daily Tribune*, May 20, 1870.

opinion of the *Tribune,* Voorhees shouted lie at a remark which all men knew to have been religiously true. His political allies, the newspaper charged, were the men who hanged Negroes and burned orphan asylums in this city and he only stultified himself in denying it.

The Washington correspondent of the New York *Daily Tribune* wrote that Brooks desired to make a point with his Catholic constituents. This opinion was shared by the Washington *Weekly Chronicle*[36] which added that Brooks desired to intensify the false impression of the hostility of the Republicans as a party to the papal religion. The Washington paper charged that in their desperate endeavor to regain power in this country the Democratic leaders were willing to resort to any means, however unfair, and make any representations, however untruthful. In order to secure the Catholic vote for the purpose of propping up their falling fortunes as a party, they endeavored to create the impression that the Republican Party was influenced by sectarian bigotry in opposing the extravagance of sustaining an American legation in Rome. The effort was too clearly without foundation to have the effect designed. "Considerations of economy alone" concluded the Washington *Weekly Chronicle,* "should induce us to diminish the number of our ministers abroad rather than add to them," and it stated that the question was "purely political and financial and should not be regarded from a sectarian standpoint."

The debate, in the opinion of the Brooklyn *Daily Eagle,*[37] went a long way to show that, despite the denials, there was a strong leaven of Know-Nothingism latent in the ranks of the party then administering the government. Describing it as a "spicy" debate, the Cincinnati *Daily Gazette*[38] stated that the motion to revive the mission was "a cheap" way of currying favor with the Catholic authorities, by treating the head of their Church with particular consideration. Having no other motive but this to play upon religious partisanship, these demagogues had the impudence to charge that the Republicans who opposed the motion did so from religious feeling. It was a proposition of political demagogues to make money out of the public treasury

[36] Washington *Weekly Chronicle,* May 28, 1870.
[37] Brooklyn *Daily Eagle,* May 20, 1870.
[38] May 21, 1870.

to curry favor for themselves from the Catholic Church. Brooks was described as the ranking editor of the leading Know-Nothing organ and Voorhees as one who distinguished himself for his ostentatious prominence in this humiliation to the Catholic Church. But the principal feature in this performance, according to the *Daily Gazette,* was its low demagogueism. Our diplomatic establishment was far too much expanded; its principal use was to furnish fat and easy places for political adherents. There was no sensible reason for keeping a minister resident at Rome. These men knew the House would not consent to send one, as it was contrary to the Democratic nature to create an office to be filled by Republican appointment. But they improved the occasion to make a bid for the favor of the authorities of the Catholic Church; they wanted to be represented as defenders of that Church. Therefore, they moved to send a minister to Rome when they had no other reason than to flatter the Church, and thus they had thrust this religious question into the debate. The Republicans, according to the *Daily Gazette,* opposed the revival of the Roman mission for the single reason that it was wholly unnecessary. The rest of the debate on their side was answering attacks upon the Protestant religion. But while the Cincinnati paper opposed the creation of a mission to Rome for the same reason that it opposed most of America's diplomatic establishment, because it was useless, there were other and even stronger reasons. First, the Roman government was not an independent power since it could not stand for a day if the French troops were withdrawn. Second, that government assumed to be a spiritual power over all the earth, above all temporal government. To hold diplomatic relations with it was in some sort to recognize its pretentions. Third, the Pope's encyclical letter, *Quanta Cura* and the *Syllabus of Errors* were a condemnation of the fundamental principles of the American government. To send a minister to reside at Rome was to accept meekly this condemnation. Since Pius IX assumed infallibility as God's viceregent, the newspaper asked, how can we have diplomatic relations with him without recognizing this claim? The *Daily Gazette* believed that in thus pronouncing, as by the word of God, his condemnation of the great principles of the American government, the Pontiff held the paramount allegiance of the whole Catholic priesthood in America, who, in turn, held virtually the

paramount allegiance of all Catholic citizens. Is this pretended spiritual power, asked the newspaper, that arrays American citizens against their government a thing for us to acknowledge by sending a diplomatic minister?

Even the Wisconsin *State Journal*,[39] in a two-column report on the "lively" debate in the House, declared that the Democrats had made "party capital," bidding for the Catholic vote on this question and indulging again "in their usual rhodomontade." The Providence *Daily Journal*[40] declared that nothing could be more false than the charge that the Roman mission was discontinued out of any disrespect to the Pope or his Church. The only reason was that it was conceded to be an entirely useless expenditure of money. Besides, the *Daily Journal* reminded its readers that the mission was not reciprocated by any Roman mission to the United States and it was abolished simply as the saving of so much useless expense. Believing that all diplomatic missions should be abolished because they were cumbersome, expensive and obsolete, the *Daily Journal* suggested the appointment of special ambassadors as particular occasions arose. However, the Providence paper admitted that it was not easy to abolish all missions, for what would administrations and their advisers do without these attractive posts to bestow on their friends?

The New York *World*[41] gave the subject considerable attention. The outburst in Congress, it is said, reflected no credit on the temper, intelligence, or sense of decorum of the Republican side of the House. The *World* admitted that Brooks had a large Catholic constituency; but that was no reason why an insult should be offered both to him and to the Catholics. It was the theory of American institutions that a member of Congress should pay some regard to the wishes of those who elected him. But other members had no right to make an insulting attack on the religion of his constituents when his motion only looked to the revival of a mission originally established and long continued for purely diplomatic purposes. Such "bigoted impertinence" was insulting not only to all America, but to a large majority

[39] Madison, May 21, 1870.
[40] May 23, 1870.
[41] May 21, 1870.

of the nations with whom it held diplomatic intercourse. If there were reasons for supporting a minister near any foreign government, the fact that it was Catholic had no pertinence as an objection. The question of reviving the mission to Rome, declared the *World*, should be decided without any reference to religion, except insofar as religion might incidentally affect the politics of foreign countries. If the power of religion as a political force was not yet spent, it was, in proportion to its influence, as reasonable a subject for watchfulness as any other. Even if the Catholic hierarchy were as great an obstruction to the progress of intelligence and freedom as its Republican assailants in Congress painted it, that was no valid argument against maintaining a mission at Rome, said the *World*. On that hypothesis, the mission would be justifiable on the same principle that America sent spies into an enemy's camp in time of war. During the century and a half that the politics of Europe hinged on the great contest for ascendancy between the Catholic and Protestant powers, no Protestant nation could afford to be ignorant of the councils and projects of the Catholic sovereigns, and embassies were never more repugnant as vehicles of intelligence.

The *World*, nevertheless, was of the opinion that every argument urged by the Republican members against reviving the mission to Rome was weak and foolish. It was said that America had little or no commerce with Rome. But the diplomatic representatives of the United States abroad, commented the journal, except when commercial treaties were to be negotiated, concerned themselves very little with commerce. That was the business of the consuls. America had a larger trade with England than with any other nation; but Mr. Motley[42] gave little or no attention to that subject. Besides, the negotiation of treaties, which were rare and might as well have been managed by transient special embassies, the chief business of a minister was the protection of his nation's citizens travelling or residing in the country to which he was sent and the collection of information. The importance of either of these functions was measured by the greatness of the country in population and commerce. America supported a minister

[42] J. Lothrop Motley was envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary from April, 1869 to December, 1870. Cf. *Dictionary of American Biography*, XIII, 282-287.

in Switzerland, a nation quite insignificant in the politics of Europe, chiefly for the sake of American travellers and tourists. But there were many more Americans at Rome than elsewhere in the region of the Alps. Rome was full of smothered violence; order and stability were preserved only by the presence of French troops. It was, therefore, important to protect the Americans there. Americans had a right to enjoy the facilities which a resident minister could have given them for intercourse with enlightened strangers visiting that capital for similar objects. In this view, the mission to Rome ranked in importance as inferior only to the missions to Paris and London. As a place for gaining such information as ministers were sent abroad to collect, Rome was more important than half of the European capitals at which the United States supported embassies. It was the inside view of things gleaned through confidential intercourse with trusted persons that formed the most valuable part of what a minister learned. If the Republican members of Congress were statesmen, concluded the *World*, or even men of creditable information, they would not vote against such a mission from narrow-minded hostility to the Catholic religion; much less would they make the proposal an occasion for attacking and insulting the faith of a large part of their fellow-citizens and of most of the nations in whose interest America asserted and upheld the Monroe Doctrine.

The *Catholic Telegraph*[43] of Cincinnati declared that some of the congressmen were sufficiently ignorant to believe that the re-establishment of the mission was a compliment to the Holy See, for which Catholics would be profuse in their gratitude at the ensuing election. As for the mass of the American people, there was no doubt that they were fully convinced that their Catholic fellow-citizens were a unit in their desire for this appointment. As the correction of this mistake might induce these political wire-pullers to turn their attention from Rome to something more beneficial to the country, the *Catholic Telegraph* printed the letter which its editor had received from Monsignor Robert Seton who expressed, according to this paper, the views of the majority of Catholics on the subject. The letter read as follows:

[43] Quoted in the New York *Sun*, May 28, 1870.

Dear Sir:

As the question of making an appropriation for a United States Minister Resident in Rome has again (May 19) been prominently brought before Congress, I respectfully request you to allow a Catholic clergyman who has lived ten years in the Eternal City to say, through your newspaper, a word upon the subject.

It seems to me, and I believe to most others, that there is no sufficient reason for making a diplomatic representative at Rome. So complete is the separation between Church and State in this country, that the Government can treat officially with the Sovereign Pontiff only as a temporal prince with a small territory and few subjects; and such being the case, I can assure you that there is no necessity for a Minister at Rome. The Hon. Mr. Blatchford, who preceded Gen. Rufus King, as representative in that city, once told me that he intended to resign (as he subsequently did) "because there was nothing to do." There are, moreover, people of culture and refinement who say that our Ministers at Rome—from Cass to King—have, judging from the standard of society, done us no honor. It is shameful to our citizens to pay the salary of some vulgar political favorite, called minister resident, who does not represent us in that full sense which is contemplated by the spirit of the law.

As a Catholic I think that it is very undesirable to have a minister at Rome. In the first place it is pretty certain that the administration would never have the courtesy to appoint a Roman Catholic and a Protestant will always be a man who would make the legation the headquarters of the disaffected to the Pontifical Government. We have in our consul at Rome, a commercial agent, quite sufficient for the simple relations of this country with the States of the Church.

If Americans desire tickets, permits, presentations and such sort of things, they can easily obtain them by applying directly to the proper officials, or through the consul or some respectable banker; the snobs who find it more fashionable to apply through a legation should not trouble plain people with their affairs. For some very curious items of information concerning the United States legation ("Ring?") at Rome during the later years of its existence let me direct the attention of your readers to a series of interesting letters that appeared a few months ago in the New York *Nation*, under the signature "A Civil Servant," and which were written by the artist Stillman,[44] at one time Consul at Rome.

---

[44] William J. Stillman (1828-1901), a native of Schenectady, New York, was a graduate of Union College. He wrote for the New York *Evening Post;* later (1855) he founded the *Crayon*. He was consul at Rome from September 6, 1861 to February 6, 1865, after which he was transferred to Crete. He later became a correspondent of the London *Times*. In 1901 he published his *Auto-*

In conclusion, I can affirm that, in my opinion, a United States Minister at Rome is tantamount to a Protestant spy at the Papal Court. Your obedient Servant,

MONSIGNOR SETON
Prothonotary Apostolic

An impartial analysis of the controversy in the public press and of the spirited debates in Congress both at the time of the closing of the mission and during the efforts that were made to revive it prove, the writer believes, that religious feeling played a considerable part in the decision of Congress not to appropriate any funds for the continuance of the American legation at the Vatican. The assurances given by Rufus King, the American minister, that there was no truth to the rumor that the American Protestant Church had been ordered by the papal authorities outside the walls of Rome failed to alter the inconsiderate and hasty decision of Congress to end diplomatic relations with the papal government. It is true that some members of the House objected to the motion to strike Rome from the diplomatic list on the ground that since the United States maintained diplomatic relations with other European countries in which the Protestant religion was not any more tolerated than it was in Rome there was no reason why an exception should be made in the case of the Pope; and it is also true that other representatives urged that a minister at the Vatican was important in order to protect the large number of Americans who visited Rome. But these reasons proved insufficient to persuade the majority of the House members who went out of their way to find arguments to support their belief that the continuance of the mission at Rome served no useful purpose. These members pointed out, for example, that since the Holy See had never reciprocated by appointing a minister to Washington there was no reason why the United States

---

biography. The more important of Stillman's despatches as consul at Rome are contained in Leo F. Stock's *Consular Relations between the United and the Papal States: Instructions and Despatches*. (Washington, 1945), pp. 214-298. On page 223 Stock, referring to Stillman's *Autobiography*, states that Chapter XIX concerns his (Stillman's) consulate at Rome, but that it is "not illuminating, being mostly abusive of [Cardinal] Antonelli, the clergy, the U. S. ministers, and of every one who disagreed with him." The letters referred to as having been published in the New York *Nation* could not be found. *Dictionary of American Biography*, XVIII, 29.

should continue to support one at the Vatican; others expressed the belief that a consul would be able to give all the protection Americans needed while in Rome, especially since the territory of the Papal States had become so restricted; still other members of Congress asserted, amidst some opposition, that the United States should terminate the mission to Rome on the false ground that the Pope had recognized the Confederacy during the Civil War. In contrast, the Italian government had expressed sincere sympathy for the preservation of the Union. As a matter of fact, as far back as 1862, during the darkest days of the Civil War, George Perkins Marsh,[45] in a hitherto unpublished despatch[46] to Secretary of State William H. Seward, expressed the hope that the appointment of a minister to the papal court would not be renewed because "it would under the present circumstance be almost an act of discourtesy to the Italian Government." Marsh explained that there was no country in Europe in which the cause of the American Union had met with so warm and hearty sympathy as in Italy. Ever since his arrival at Turin he had not seen or heard of an Italian favorably disposed to the cause of liberty in his own country, who was not friendly to the cause of the American Union. The Italian population, "with the exception of the comparatively insignificant papal faction," from the king to the peasant, was unanimous in its wishes for the triumph of the federal cause and it deserved a better return for its friendship than a step which might have been construed by the opponents of the Italian government as a triumph, and by its friends as a token of sympathy on the part of the United States with "the enemies of progress, prosperity, and independence in Italy." Marsh even then concluded that Stillman, the American consul at Rome, was perfectly competent to represent the United States "so far as our government needed to be represented at Rome," and his promotion to the rank of consul general would have given him, in the opinion of Marsh, as high a position as the English consular agent

[45] George Perkins Marsh (1801-1882), of Vermont, was commissioned as envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary on March 20, 1861, to the recently proclaimed Kingdom of Italy. He held the post until his death. Cf. *Dictionary of American Biography*, XII, 297-298.

[46] MS despatch No. 45, Turin, May 12, 1862. Archives American Embassy, Rome; National Archives, Washington, D. C.

enjoyed at the time, and as high as would have been required by any negotiation that was likely to occur with the papal authorities.

The plain truth is that the whole issue of the American-Vatican relations became intricately involved in the local domestic political issues which in those years kept the American political parties in a state of serious agitation. Although it is not the purpose of this study to investigate these issues, it must be remembered that there was a mutual, hostile feeling between the two factions of the Republican Party. The radical members of Congress, who were then in control, were anxious to embarrass and discredit President Johnson and Secretary of State Seward merely because both had opposed them in several important domestic matters. To aggravate the issue, King, although a Republican, was not a radical and was a friend of Seward.

An important consideration that led Congress to close the American legation was the conviction that Victor Emmanuel II was shortly to assume the title of king over the whole of Italy, including the remaining portions of the States of the Church. At a time when the sympathy of Americans was overwhelmingly in favor of the political unification of the entire peninsula under the House of Savoy, it did not seem wise nor proper to Congress to place any obstacle in the path of His Majesty to complete the efforts of the Italian people to become united under his enlightened leadership. It was felt that the presence of an American minister at the Vatican, at this juncture in Italian political history, would not only embarrass the position of the King of Italy, but would also thwart the efforts of the Italian patriots. Nevertheless, it is to be regretted that Congress should not have acted more openly and with greater frankness than it did. As it was, Rufus King never even received his official letter of recall, so that he was not able to take formal leave of the papal authorities. In whatever light we regard the question it was neither a very gracious exit for King nor a dignified ending to this chapter of American diplomatic history.

Columbia University

MISCELLANY

Peter E. Dietz, Pioneer Planner of Catholic Social Action

By Henry J. Browne*

The present day Catholic efforts for the reform of the social order in the United States are traced readily enough back to the ground work done by John A. Ryan. Monsignor Ryan, however, acknowledged some co-workers in the early years of what was then almost unique work for a churchman, and he indicated among these the Reverend Peter E. Dietz.[1] The latter's contribution has not been fully appreciated, although one writer has hailed him as the organizer of the movement of which Ryan has been credited as the academician.[2]

Father Dietz was born in New York City in 1878, and was educated at St. Francis Xavier College there. He later attended the University of Bonn and the Catholic University of America before his ordination to the priesthood in the cathedral of Baltimore in September, 1904. While pastor at Oberlin, Ohio, he continued an earlier interest in the cause of social justice by editing for the year 1909-1910 the English section of the recently-established *Central-Blatt and Social Justice,* the organ of the German Roman Catholic Central Verein.[3] In November, 1910, during the St. Louis convention of the American Federation of Labor, he was instrumental in bringing together, with the support and approval of Archbishop John J. Glennon, a group of Catholic labor leaders in an organization called the Militia of Christ for Social Service.

The object of this group was: "The defence of the Christian order of society and its progressive development," and its stated platform was: "The economic, ethical, sociological and political doctrine of Christian philosophy as developed in the course of history—the legacy of tradition, interpreted in modern times in the letters of Leo XIII and Pius X." It had elaborate (and, in some respects, still unfulfilled) hopes of promoting social education among Catholics, and ideas for the "compelling of social action," which included advocacy of Christian principles in trade-unions, interest in labor and reform legislation, yearly conventions conjointly with that of the A.F. of L., a Catholic celebration of Labor Day, and a policy of conciliation, trade-agreements, and arbitration. The ranks of the Militia were open

* Father Browne, a priest of the Archdiocese of New York, is the author of a forthcoming volume on the Catholic Church and the Knights of Labor.

[1] John A. Ryan, *Social Doctrine in Action* (New York, 1941), p. 286.

[2] Aaron I. Abell, "The Reception of Leo XIII's Labor Encyclical in America, 1891-1919," *The Review of Politics,* VII (October, 1945), 488.

[3] *The Catholic Herald Citizen* (Milwaukee), October 18, 1947.

only to "practical Catholics who accept as an axiom, the principle of trade-unionism." [4]

Dietz's own words are the best testimonial to his efforts, by plans and programs, to make the word of Leo XIII's *Rerum Novarum* come alive. At the outset, in telling John Mitchell of the preparation of the membership magazine, *Social Service,* he reported:

> For the rest I have been quietly working via correspondence. The work has extended slowly. I have quite a number of professional men too. The approval of a number of bishops and of the Apostolic delegate.[5] But there is so much prejudice among the upper ranks against unionism that it will require hard work to drive it out. Yet I am sure it can be done, among Catholics at least. If I had the means, the mere material means for purposes of extension and propaganda, there would soon be a big change.[6]

A short time later he sought from this prominent labor leader a frank evaluation of the work planned, and of his own fitness "by ***nature*** and ***education***" for it.

> I have put this question to no one else because I have the larger confidence in your judgment and experience. A man cannot really size himself up; nor would I care to be sized up by others were it not that I want to know that I am right first, before making it a life endeavor.[7]

In his discussion of a time and place for a conference of the lay officers Mitchell did not neglect, after a reading of *Social Service,* to reply that he thought the program "sound and progressive," and that, "if you do not take the lead, some one else not so well equipped will do it in your stead." He observed further:

> I believe that the Catholic people should be in the vanguard in the movement for constructive social and industrial reform, and whether there be any justification for the charge, there is a widespread impression that our church is just a little over-conservative in matters of this kind; therefore, it seems to me that our people should adopt and pursue a systematic program for social betterment; that we should identify ourselves with

---

[4] Printed announcement, Oberlin, Ohio, n.d. This and the following letters are taken from the Dietz-Mitchell correspondence preserved in the papers of John Mitchell which are now in the custody of the Mullen Library of the Catholic University of America. Mitchell (1870-1919), president of the United Mine Workers, 1898-1908, came into national prominence with the anthracite strike of 1900. He was conservative and conciliating and at this time was chairman of the Trades-Agreement Department of the National Civic Federation, a group of capitalists, labor leaders, and representatives of the public which was founded in 1900 and professed to seek industrial peace by business methods and to oppose anti-union employers as well as Socialists.

[5] Archbishop Diomede Falconio, who was in Washington from 1902 to 1911.

[6] Dietz to Mitchell, Oberlin, April 10, 1911.

[7] *Ibid.,* May 29, 1911.

> the movement to promote legislation, that is, constructive legislation, for the protection of that great part of the people in our country who are least able to protect themselves.[8]

The meeting was arranged for Washington on Mitchell's suggestion since three other members of the executive council of the A.F. of L., which was meeting there about June 15, were also on the directorate of the Militia of Christ.[9] The suggestion to admit an outsider to the conference, such as the eminent Catholic lawyer of Philadelphia, Walter George Smith, whom Dietz had in mind, was frowned on by his lay associate who believed, "that the representative labor men would prefer to talk with you before discussing the affairs of the organization with others not so directly connected with the labor movement."[10] One of the fruits of their discussion was a letter from several of the labor leaders to Bishop John P. Farrelly of Cleveland,[11] asking that Father Dietz be allowed to give more time and effort to the extension of this special work.[12] It also served to stimulate the priest to carry on and to elaborate new plans, for he wrote:

> Please accept my thanks for the favor in writing to my bishop as well as for the enclosed contribution for the work of the Militia. I am now almost reconciled to the eventuality of leaving Oberlin. What you said at the conference about Washington being the fountain-head of national information etc. had its effect. Several other friends in Washington urged me strongly to get into close touch with the Catholic University as I would thus have the backing of a great institution and the weight of influence of its patrons and the best Catholic scholarship of the land. All this however did not sink in deep enough until on the way back. About the time that we passed the summit of the Alleghanies, I had my mind made up to try in that direction. I have consequently written the rector of the University to get his opinion as to the advisability of the plan, and in the event of a favorable reply I will approach the Cardinal.[13] I will have no difficulty with my bishop in getting a release and it would solve the difficulties in

---

[8] Mitchell to Dietz, n.p., June 1, 1911, copy.

[9] These were James O'Connell, President of the International Association of Machinists and First Vice-President of the Council, Denis A. Hayes, President of the International Association of Glass Bottle Blowers, and Fourth Vice-President and John B. Alpine, President of the International Association of Plumbers and Steamfitters and Seventh Vice-President. Mitchell was Second Vice-President.

[10] Dietz to Mitchell, Oberlin, June 6, 1911. Mitchell to Dietz, n.p., June 8, 1911, copy.

[11] The ordinary of that diocese from 1909 to his death in 1921.

[12] Mitchell to Dietz, n.p., June 24, 1911. He explained that O'Connell had been called away or he would also have signed. Mitchell and John R. Alpine to Rt. Rev. John P. Farrelly, Washington, June 17, 1911.

[13] James Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore from 1877 to 1921 and Chancellor of the University from 1889 to his death.

that line also. I will simply burn all ships behind me and trust to God and to you men.[14]

Although he did not succeed in affiliating with the University, the Oberlin pastor was released from duty for a year and took to the road lecturing.[15] That same summer his work won the endorsement of the American Federation of Catholic Societies which in convention at Columbus, Ohio, set up a Social Service Commission consisting of himself as secretary, and besides the chairman, the Most Reverend Peter J. Muldoon, Bishop of Rockford,[16] also the Reverend John Cavanaugh, C.S.C., President of the University of Notre Dame, James E. Hagerty, professor of economics at Ohio State University, and Charles I. Denechaud, an attorney of New Orleans. To this action was added the support of the Archbishop of St. Louis who was so well pleased, "as to recommend the holding of a social conference to which the best Catholic minds are to be invited." Dietz's greatest worry was lack of financial backing. "I do not know," he said, "how I am going to make a living—but probably I will anyhow and in some way. Ideals are a fine thing to help you keep poor. I am satisfied to accept this fact for myself—but I will need the assistance of others soon, and I must be able to pay for it." [17]

By the end of the year 1911 he went further in expounding his difficulties and his dreams:

> I write with much hesitation. But you will let me speak and I will be brief. I have brought a great sacrifice, the burden of which is only now becoming felt. The fault, if there is one, is solely my own; you warned me against it at one time. But my faith in a good cause remains unshaken; if I do not succeed, it is because something is wanting in myself.
>
> I have come through the first year without being in debt. For all my pains I have an ideal consolation only and not a promising outlook. The earliest hopes of the "Militia of Christ" are not fulfilled yet I am equally sure that the movement has justified itself. The McNamara case is the very finest argument for it.[18] What a saving it would have been to the Church, to the Federation of Labor and to human faith in general, and

---

[14] Dietz to Mitchell, Oberlin, June 26, 1911.

[15] *Ibid.*, July 11, 1911.

[16] In that see from 1908 to his death in 1927. He was important in similar work for the National Catholic War Council.

[17] *Ibid.*, August 20, 1911.

[18] On December 15, 1911, J. B. McNamara had been sentenced to life imprisonment and his brother, John J. McNamara (Secretary-Treasurer of International Association of Bridge and Structural Iron Workers) to fifteen years in connection with the bombing of the Los Angeles *Times* building which killed twenty people. They had finally pleaded guilty in order to effect this settlement, although organized labor had strongly defended their innocence and protested especially the questionable extradition of the union official.

intellectual, moral and financial saving, if that which is the object of the Militia of Christ could have been done for the McNamaras.

Mr. Mitchell, those who are on the Directorate of the Militia of Christ have done little beyond lending their names. I have been left alone without men and means. The seven hundred subscriptions, the literary contributions, the sporadic words of encouragement—all these things helped and were most gratefully received—but they did not fan the spark to the point of ignition. The hope of existence was kept alive—that's all.

I may be to blame; perhaps I haven't the right business instinct. I might have put solicitors in the field. Could I have risked it without a sure view ahead? I hesitate again now to ask for the renewal of subscriptions for fear that I may not be able to do as well the second year as in the first. I do not know if it is prudence or the lack of initiative. At any rate I have come to the conclusion that I must depend upon something more substantial than heretofore. Experience and development teach me to go to the bottom and to build from the ground up systematically, if I continue at all.

How? It seems to me now that we ought to begin with a school of Social Service on the plan of the Socialist Rand School of Social Science in New York.[19] With this school we could develop a corps of workers who will give themselves entirely to this work. The Federation of Catholic Societies is a vast and still chaotic formation. A tremendous bulk full of unrealized power. I was instrumental last summer at its convention in getting a standing committee on "Social Service". I have even had the naming of the Committee. . . . I am secretary of the Committee, yet what can I recommend? The men and the means are wanting.

The Y.M.C.A. are successful as far as they go, through the work of the Y.M.C.A. secretaries, who receive a special training for that work. Now by a School of Social Service we could furnish trained secretaries to the Federation of Catholic Societies, and then the way would be clear to real systematic progress.

The idea of the School would be not to furnish a higher professional education, but to give a business course, say of one or two years preparation, in political science and history, the labor movement, sociology, economics, philosophy, oratory and journalism. The rest would follow without difficulty.

You alone, singlehanded, could make this school a probability and a lasting memorial to your name. Ten or fifteen thousand dollars would be sufficient for the foundation of the school. It would be the point of ignition. It will take care of itself and grow rapidly after it is once started; there would be a basis for popular confidence.

It will also make possible a community of priests who will make Social Service their prime object, just as the Jesuits and other orders specialized according to the needs of the times. Two priests have already told me that they would be ready to give up their parishes and devote themselves to social work, but I could not give them the word.

I have hardly a doubt that if we could talk the matter over with some men of means, who are glad of your acquaintance and friendship, matters would soon be arranged. Or if that were impractical, would you not be able to sacrifice one month of your time to lecture before Catholic audiences for

---

[19] This school was founded in 1905, devoting itself especially to workers' education, but also to research.

this purpose? Your great popularity with American audiences would bring a return of all that would be necessary for the foundation of so great an undertaking, and once and for all this movement would be on its feet.

On my way home from Atlanta, I visited some of the coal mines of Tennessee and Western Virginia; in none of the places visited was there a miner's union. In some places, the conditions are truly "hellish." It was in these parts that the idea of the school became so predominant in my mind. I would like to build the school in the neighborhood of Knoxville for many reasons.

Now, in conclusion, please overlook the human parts of this letter and judge me only by the spirit. I am just as ready, I trust, to accept complete defeat and humiliation as I am to meet with success, and I want no better assurance of my own "rightness." The cause, is surely good and if I do not accomplish it, God has reserved it for some one else.[20]

Mitchell was quick to explain his own inability to help, since he not only refused on principle to collect funds from employers or financiers, but also because he was aware of his own feeble attraction as a lecturer before a paying audience. He suggested a circular letter of appeal and assured Dietz:

> In fact, in some respects it would be much better to depend upon small subscriptions from a large number of men. The greatest handicap under which the National Civic Federation labors is the charge that it is supported financially by a small number of men and that therefore it must be conducted in the interest of those who support it financially.[21]

The year 1913 found Father Dietz still functioning—but from Milwaukee and more in the capacity of secretary of the Social Service Commission of the American Federation of Catholic Societies.[22] The Militia continued closely affiliated with this group, and Dietz drew up a draft of its constitution which met with Mitchell's criticism for not declaring specifically for such "definite principles and reforms" as a more equitable distribution of wealth, wage and hour legislation, abolition of child labor, organization of wage-earners, etc. He said further in an unprecedented tone:

> If upon principles of this kind Catholic men and women can unite, then they can be of real service to society. Unless the Militia of Christ (and, by the way, I believe the name should be changed in order to remove misunderstanding) can declare for the above or something substantially like it, I doubt that any real good will be accomplished through it.[23]

Taking these remarks quite calmly, the priest tried to show the labor leader the slowness of pace from the ideal to the practical. The Commission was to get space in the publication of the Federation and at the annual conven-

[20] Dietz to Mitchell, Oberlin, December 30, 1911.

[21] Mitchell to Dietz, n.p., January 3, 1912, copy.

[22] Dietz to Mitchell, Milwaukee, July [ ], 1912.

[23] Mitchell to Dietz, Chicago, August 1, 1912, copy.

tion in Louisville they would have a special conference with papers on such subjects as the organized and unorganized workers, the employer, and public opinion and social legislation. He said of the Catholic group fostering trade-unionism:

> You are aware that for years I have been trying to influence Catholic Federation into this field. The Militia of Christ was organized largely as a lever for that body. The Federation is heavy and slow. All great bodies are. . . . I am satisfied to relinquish the title "Militia of Christ" for a specific cause. That for which it stood in my mind will have to be divided into three parts; 1. A "Catholic Federation of Labor" Loyalty to A.F. of L. Trade-Unionists as well as non-trade-unionists. Minimum wages, Trade-agreements, Arbitration etc. 2. A "Catholic Federation of Employers" recognizing the trade-agreement etc. 3. A select body from these two and other Catholic fields to furnish writers and lecturers. I would like to see the compact entirety have a body influence on social legislation.[24]

The continuance of Dietz's work of conducting lectures, attending conventions, and issuing a weekly syndicated letter to the Catholic press seems to indicate that the Commission became a kind of enlargement of the Militia.[25] The dual-functioning secretary was able to report, "The idea of the work is now spreading very rapidly."[26] It was sufficient at least to arouse Socialists by opposing their inroads on American trade unionism.[27] The Catholic group in its turn was accused of seeking to get control of the labor movement, to oust Sam Gompers, and, "to fill the places of the few other protestants who still hold positions at the head of Labor Unions." At the very time these people protested, "We will not permit the Roman Catholic Priesthood to dictate to us American working men," a Catholic committee was seeking from their leaders a more explicit support of the American labor movement.[28] They presented a memorial "signed by the

[24] Dietz to Mitchell, Milwaukee, August 3, 1912.

[25] Abell, *op cit.*, p. 491.

[26] Dietz to Mitchell, Milwaukee, September 8, 1912.

[27] Abell, *op. cit.*, p. 489. He asserts also that the cause suffered from the opposition of "well-to-do" Catholics of the "better sort." p. 494.

[28] Their language was not that of reasonable objectors, but rather the familiar refrain of bigotry, e.g., "They curse our institutions and at the same time, try to control them. The old imbecile on the Tiber ought to get out, put on a plug hat and travel some, and catch up with the times, and not brood longer over past Glory, such as the roasting of Bruno and Pascale, and moan because he can't do it now. The only thing that makes him cheerful is the hope that these glorious days may return again, and if he succeeds in chloroforming Americans, they will return. . . . The Labor Unions are honeycombed with these Roman Traitors. . . . The question is, why should there be an inner circle of Roman Catholics in our unions. . . . "The Militia of Christ. Who Are They, and What Are They Organized For?" (Printed, undated, unsigned, 3 pp.).

most prominent Catholic Labor Leaders" to James Cardinal Gibbons who assured them of "great personal interest." [29] It read:

Your Eminence:

We, the undersigned, affiliated with the Militia of Christ, and interested directly in the conservation and progress of trade-union ideals, feel certain that much harm can be prevented and much good accomplished by the publication and promulgation of an official document on the part of the hierarchy of the United States, that will make clear once for all the Catholic position in the organized labor movement of this Country.

Pope Leo XIII, in his letter on the labor question has laid down in unmistakeable language the universal teaching of the church, yet in the local application, especially as pertaining to the problems of labor organization, there has been a variety of interpretation on the Continent, and in this country we are confronted with a situation equally if not more difficult.[30] We therefore petition your Eminence most humbly and respectfully for an official document in the premises.

Among the reasons that prompt us are the following: 1. The unsettled state of the Catholic mind and of many priests on the relation of Pope Leo's Encyclical to the organized labor movement of this country the American Federation of labor. This neutrality especially on the part of many of the clergy is a positive obstacle to progress and a ready weapon for the enemy. 2. Catholic laymen in the ranks and as leaders of labor, are oftentimes discouraged because of the lack of moral support by the church in their struggle for the betterment of human conditions. 3. The unlightened attitude of the secular press in particular, added to other causes contributes not a little to the demoralization of the Catholic laity both within and without the movement of organized labor and calls for positive declaration and guidance. 4. On the other hand we feel positive that from the intellectual and moral treasury of Christian Doctrine there may be brought forth both norms of trades-unionism, but also its complex problems as affecting legislation and the courts as well as society in general. (*sic*) In our Catholic confidence we feel that here is a splendid opportunity for the Catholic Church in our time and country.

If in your good judgment, it appear opportune to prepare such an official document, we stand ready to assist in the preliminaries by way of counsel or conference or in whatever way that suggests itself to your Eminence.

In conclusion, we again express our conviction that such a document dealing concretely especially with the problem of labor organization in this country, when read from the pulpits of our churches, and promulgated

---

[29] "Report of the Secretary of the Social Service Commission. August 1912-August 1913."

[30] This was high-lighted by the encyclical *Singulari Quadam* of September 24, 1912 which allowed German Catholics to belong to non-Catholic unions. Its application to the United States was discussed in the *Central-Blatt and Social Justice*, V (Jan., Feb., Mar. 1913) 217-219, 243-245, 269-272. The author, W. E., saw no great reason against Catholics supporting the A.F. of L., although it was most necessary to have parallel associations of Catholic workers to supply the deficiencies of not having a Catholic union. The Militia, in his opinion, was hardly the answer in the United States.

> in our Catholic press and societies will be a veritable God send to the Catholic laity.[31]

Nothing resembling such a document was forthcoming until the so-called Bishops' Program of Social Reconstruction, issued on February 12, 1919, by which time Dietz's national organizing and planning for Catholic social action had been superseded.[32] World War I found him in Europe working toward an international Christian labor federation and so he spent some time in neutral Spain making further social studies. In 1917 the American Federation of Catholic Societies gave way to the National Catholic War Council, which after the making of peace became the Welfare Council, (called Conference after 1922). It was maintained under the direction of the hierarchy and included in its framework the Social Action Department. After several years of work in Cincinnati where he established and conducted one of his cherished projects, the American Academy of Christian Democracy, Father Dietz returned to Milwaukee in 1922 and in the following year established a parish at Whitefish Bay, Wisconsin. In token of their friendship and esteem for a priest who had attended their annual conventions since 1909, and whom they had "known and admired and heeded," the A.F. of L. gave him a gift of $2,500. He died there on October 11, 1947,[33] leaving no great monument of organization, but a pioneer example of self-effacing priestly work, and the incentive of many unfulfilled hopes. These hopes Father Dietz once summed up thus:

> The work that I am trying to do for several years is growing steadily, not always as I would wish, yet it grows and when once the Catholic social conscience is thoroughly aroused, it will become the social influence that it should have had long ago.[34]

The Catholic University of America

[31] Dated November 21, 1912, Rochester, New York, possibly since that was the home of the vice-president, John S. Whalen. There is no copy in the Baltimore Cathedral Archives.

[32] John A. Ryan, *Social Reconstruction* (New York, 1920), pp. 217-238, gives the text.

[33] *The Catholic Herald Citizen* (Milwaukee), October 18, 1947.

[34] Dietz to Mitchell, Milwaukee, July 5, 1913. The worth and work of Peter E. Dietz, it is hoped, will be further elaborated in scholarly studies which will make use of his papers presently in the custody of the Catholic Central Verein in St. Louis.

BOOK REVIEWS

GENERAL CHURCH HISTORY

A History of the Church. Volume III. *The Revolt against the Church: Aquinas to Luther.* By Philip Hughes. (New York: Sheed and Ward. 1947. Pp. xvi, 556. $4.00.)

Perhaps there are very few fields of instruction so poorly provided with satisfactory general surveys as is church history. Textbooks are far from what could be desired. But over and above textbooks the teacher looks in vain for accounts of a general, yet thorough, kind that may serve his better-conditioned students as a background to the lectures. It is safe to say that nothing of this latter kind has existed in English. Of translations, Mourret is the best. But Mourret is very long and, good though it is, it does not begin to furnish a statement comparable to this one in succinct analysis and power of illumination.

To begin with, Hughes has the gift of emancipation from the tedious and meaningless chronological slavery to which writers like Mann are subject and from which writers like Pastor are not exempt. He seizes upon the main factors of will or circumstance that give unity to a certain period and subordinates to these the details in a manner which carries the interest of the reader who seeks to understand. In this he probably owes a great deal to his familiarity with the brilliant French historiographers. Even did his bibliographical references not reveal this relationship you might deduce it from the historical style in which the writers of that nation surpass their so much esteemed contemporaries across the Rhine. Anyone who has used the French writers, for example Leclercq's marvellous commentaries on Hefele, cannot but be gratified to see their methods of treatment coming into wider use. It is clear that Hughes has profited greatly by the learning of writers like Leclercq, Dufourcq, Digard, etc., and that he has gotten from their practice of maintaining a high level of writing excellence some of the clarity and fineness of his own prose.

The mention of Hughes' dependence upon the French scholars is not to be taken as a disparagement. Every writer of a broad survey has, of course, to depend upon those who have given closer attention to a narrower field of view. Assuredly the author has contributed much that is his own. To borrow from the large considerations of Dufourcq, from the incisive though unsystematic annotations of Leclercq, from the detailed and learned specialists, and to bring the results of these borrowings into a presentation of great proportion and balance is to perform a feat of scholarship far from ordinary. To give in one chapter, for example, a clear and adequate description of the papal policies with reference to Anjou and the Empire, to weave in with it a narrative of the manifold and confusing events and to make the narrative progressive, accurate, and

non-confusing, to hold a scholarly balance in the presentation of the opposing principles and prejudices of the secular and ecclesiastical contestants, to give brilliant aperçus on the relation to events of the contemporary thoughts and ideas, to contrive for the succeeding periods a style of exposition that will be suited to the changing forms and pressures, to move through 250 years and 500 pages without laming or going stale, to leave the reader at the end of each chapter with the feeling that he has never seen it done so well before, to accomplish all this is to have achieved a masterpiece. And that is what this book seems to this reviewer.

The volume is not to be thought of as a work of "edification," except for those proficient enough in scholarship and wisdom to understand the rich role of the Church in the affairs of men. As another writer has said: "The medieval Church strove to make States conform in their legislation to the commandments of Christianity. But the medieval Church had a long and manifold experience of the impossibility of ever stabilizing such conformity. Against the commandment of Christianity to seek *first* the kingdom of God, human nature will always assert its right to seek *first* its own. And every single group of men which obtains control of society and is able to enforce its views in the fashioning of laws, will know how to maintain its special interests." That this rule applies to *all* groups, even to ecclesiastical ones, is among the sober facts of history. And Hughes relates and comments upon all this with a decent honesty and fairness which are as much in contrast with the overstrained pieties and prudentialities of the commonplace ecclesiastical scribe as they are with the outrageous and still triumphant hatreds of the secularized theologians who write so much of history. His book will do much to correct the "déformation professionelle" of those who will use it. It is sad to think of what a time it will take, and how much more history must be enacted, before the kind of world arrives in which it will be possible for those with quite another "déformation professionelle" to read and mark the contents of this admirable work of Catholic scholarship.

JOHN K. CARTWRIGHT

St. Matthew's Cathedral
Washington

Le Bienheureux Innocent V (Pierre De Tarentaise) et son Temps. By M.-H. Laurent. Appendices de C. Giannelli et de L.-B. Gillon [Studii Testii, 129]. (Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. 1947. Pp. ix, 547. 350 lire.)

The last few years have seen a lively interest in the thirteenth-century Dominican, Peter of Tarentaise, who became pope under the name of Innocent V. A number of articles on his life and theological works have appeared in the reviews, and, in 1943, a collection of studies on him was

edited by the Dominicans of Santa Sabina in Rome under the title *Beatus Innocentius V (Petrus de Tarentasia, O.P.) Studia et Documenta.* However, no complete and satisfactory biography of the man was available, the work which P. Mouthon produced in 1896 having too many shortcomings to make it acceptable to the critical historian.

Père Laurent's work is a scholarly and scientific attempt to supply the most complete view of the life and times of Innocent V that existing documents will allow. It is more than a biography, for, particularly in the later chapters, it presents a complete and exhaustive picture of the political situation in which the pontiff found himself.

It is impossible in a brief notice to give a detailed account of the contents of the book, but a few of the outstanding features can be noted. Concerning the much disputed questions of the date of Peter's birth and of his age when he entered the Order of Preachers, the author accepts the traditional 1225 as the approximate date of birth and would have Peter entering the Dominicans when about sixteen. In both these conclusions he disagrees with Père Creytens who, in his article in the *Studia et Documenta,* would advance the date of birth "by some years" but would insist that Peter entered the order when nine or ten.

Père Laurent has offered an ingenious explanation for the thorny problem of why Peter was recalled from the office of provincial of France the first time and returned to the classroom. The chronology here has always been difficult. Père Laurent would make Peter's first term as provincial begin in 1264, not 1262, as has commonly been held. He would then explain the matter this way. At the general chapter of 1264 Peter was denounced to John of Vercelli, master general of the order, for teaching unsound doctrine. He was removed from his teaching post at Paris till the charge could be investigated. The members of the province of France expressed their resentment of the action by choosing Peter for their provincial. The suspected propositions were then sent to Thomas Aquinas for judgment and when, in 1267, Peter was cleared of the false charges he was absolved from his duties as provincial and allowed to return to the classroom. This mode of action may seem a bit strange today, but the author cites evidence to show that the teaching office was so highly esteemed among the thirteenth-century preachers that a chair at Paris might well be preferred to the provincialate.

In treating of Peter's relations with the Byzantine Emperor Michael VIII, Paeleologus, the author calls attention to a second embassy sent to Gregory X in 1275 by the emperor. This embassy has, he says, been for the most part ignored. In an appendix there is presented an important account by one of the members of this mission—a document hitherto unedited and now given in the Greek with a French translation.

Other appendices include a study on the writings of Peter and their

chronology, with a special emphasis on the commentaries on St. Paul, some documents from the chancery of Charles of Anjou, and Père Laurent's catalogue of the printed "acts" concerning Innocent. This catalogue as well as parts of several of the later chapters of the book appeared previously in the *Studia et Documenta*.

The work, unfortunately, contains no bibliography, although complete bibliographical information is always included in the first footnote entry. The almost thirty pages of index are limited to proper names, but since all authors cited are listed here, it will partially supply, when used with the footnotes, for the absent bibliography.

PAUL M. STARRS

College of St. Albert the Great
Oakland, California

Studia Eucharistica. DCC[i] anni a condito Festo Sanctissimi Corporis Christi, 1246-1946. (Antwerp: De Nederlandsche Boekhandel. 1946. Pp. xv, 454. Bel. frs. 350.)

In 1946 the Church celebrated the 700th anniversary of the institution of the feast of Corpus Christi. The Reverend Stephen Axters, O.P., a professor at the Dominican house of studies in Liège, felt that this important centenary should be commemorated by a series of scholarly articles. He therefore secured the services of a number of European historians and theologians. Of the nineteen contributors eleven are from Belgium, a fact that is hardly surprising since it was there that the feast was introduced and received its first ecclesiastical approval.

This book naturally treats of a great variety of subjects pertaining to the Eucharist and Corpus Christi, and yet at the same time it possesses a certain unity and coherence. Thus the first part has five articles on the place and persons closely associated with the beginning of the new feast, the claim of Liège to be the diocese where Corpus Christi originated, the part played by Eva, a recluse of this city and a friend of St. Juliana, in persuading Pope Urban IV to extend the new feast to the universal Church, the first office of Corpus Christi, and the eucharistic doctrine of two contemporaneous theologians, Alger of Liège and St. Thomas Aquinas.

The devotion of Catholics in the Middle Ages towards the Eucharist is the main theme of the second section. The religious are represented by the Praemonstratensians, Carthusians, and Cistercians, and the laity by the Beguines and the Confraternities of the Blessed Sacrament. The history of the Eucharist in Irish history and liturgy is given as well as an account of a debate on this dogma of faith by a Catholic and heretic in England. All of these seven articles assert, or at least imply, how important the feast of Corpus Christi was in developing the dogma of the Eucharist

and in furthering devotion to the Blessed Sacrament by the more frequent reception of Holy Communion.

In the third section the writers discuss the influence of the new feast upon the composition of hymns and prayers, the inspiration which it provided to artists, and the changes which it brought about in the construction of tabernacles. In an appendix there are twenty-four beautiful pictures, which illustrate the text of many of these articles and also reveal the ardent piety of the faithful for their eucharistic God. Since all the contributors to this volume were limited in their treatment of the Eucharist and Corpus Christi, there could be no more fitting conclusion than the essay on the Council of Trent. Its definitions and regulations about the Mass and the Blessed Sacrament are an excellent summary of the beliefs of Catholics in the Middle Ages and, according to Pope Pius XII, rank second in importance only to the words of Sacred Scripture itself.

The present volume contains a veritable mine of information on the Eucharist in general and the feast of Corpus Christi in particular. All of the authors, while comparatively unknown in America, have made a worthwhile contribution to historical and theological scholarship. Three articles, deserving of special praise, are on St. Thomas Aquinas, the Cistercians, and the Council of Trent. The editors are to be highly commended for devoting thirty-four pages to a thorough and up-to-the-minute bibliography on almost every subject connected with the Eucharist and the feast of Corpus Christi. It is a pity, therefore, that eight of the nineteen articles or 170 pages are in Flemish. Just as the reviewer, through the kindness of the Canonesses of St. Augustine from Belgium, was able to obtain a thorough digest in English of these articles, so the editor could easily have had them translated into one of the languages familiar to scholars throughout the world. Nevertheless, because of the reasons given above, *Studia Eucharistica* is a worthy literary monument to the *Mysterium fidei* and deserves an honored place on every theological book-shelf.

STEPHEN MCKENNA

St Clement's Mission House
Ephrata, Pennsylvania

Alexandro Valignano, S.J., *Il Ceremoniale per i missionari del Giappone. "Advertimentos e avisos acerca dos costumes e catangues de Jappão." Importante documento circa i metodi de adattamento nella missione giapponese del secolo XVI.* Testo portoghese del manoscritto originale, Versione letterale italiana. Edizione critica, introduzione e note di Giuseppe Fr. Schütte, S.J. (Roma: Edizione di "Storia e Letteratura." 1946. Pp. xv, 359.)

This is a manual of the Japanese rules of courtesy for the use of the Jesuit missionaries in Japan during the sixteenth century by the well-

known visitor of the Jesuit missions in India, Alexander Valignano, S.J.

In October, 1578, Valignano landed at Macao on his way to Japan. There he learned of the "marvellous progress" of the missionary work in Japan, and he ordered celebrations of thanksgiving to be held at Macao, Malakka, and Goa. But one year later, when he reached Japan, he found that he had been wrongly informed. On the island of Kyūshū there were, indeed, many Christians, but they were not only very ignorant of their religion but showed also very little zeal, since a good many of them—some of the Christian princes not excepted—had adopted Christianity only so as to enjoy the many advantages of the lucrative Macao trade. It took a long time before Valignano, who in the beginning had to rely solely on the scanty linguistic knowledge of the missionaries, could get to the root of the trouble. Yet finally he succeeded in winning the confidence of the Japanese, and he was able to obtain genuine information from both Japanese Jesuits and native Christians. He was told that the fathers not only did not know Japanese well enough, but that especially their utter neglect in adapting themselves to the customs of the country had caused a great loss of prestige. The Christian princes of Kyūshū, in particular, pointed out that it was absolutely necessary for the missionaries to know the Japanese rules of courtesy so as to treat each one according to his rank; for if they were to show too little respect in dealing with the Japanese, they would be considered impolite and little better than barbarians; and if, on the other hand, they were to do too much honor to the lower classes, they would thereby degrade themselves and meet with contempt. Hence the Prince of Bungo, Ōtomo Sōrin, a great expert in Zen-Buddhism, suggested that the fathers should adopt the refined ceremonial of the bonzes of this most influential sect of Buddhism.

Valignano enthusiastically accepted this suggestion. He consulted the leading missionaries, and it was finally agreed that the missionaries should, as far as feasible, conform to the Zen-ceremonial. Valignano himself, with the help of Japanese Jesuits and friends, drew up a code of rules of courtesy which was to be obligatory to all but subject to amendment. The guiding idea was that the fathers should behave with the dignity of the Zen bonzes so as to command respect for the cause they were working for. They were to have, more or less, even the same grades as the monks of Zen-Buddhism. The vice-provincial, the highest superior of the mission, was to hold the rank of the Abbot of Nanzen-ji (Nanzen Monastery in Kyōto); the regional superiors of the districts of Shimo and Bungo in Kyūshū and of Miyako (Kyoto) in central Japan were to correspond in rank to the abbots of the five famous Zen-monasteries in Kyoto; the priests were to hold the rank of "higher monks" (*chōrō*, or *tōdō*), the brothers were to be *shūsa*, the novices, *zōsu*, and the catechists, *jisha*. When paying and receiving visits, all were to conform to the rules of

their respective ranks, and the same applied to their journeys and apostolic travels.

In 1585, a copy of the manuscript was presented to Father Claudio Aquaviva, the General of the Society of Jesus. The idea of adaptation in diet and living was greatly welcomed, but the introduction of different ranks among the members of the order as well as the strong emphasis on guarding one's honor and authority were frowned upon as incompatible with religious simplicity. Consequently, Valignano was advised to be on his guard lest on the plea of adaptation to the country the genuine spirit of the constitutions of the Society of Jesus might be sacrificed. Valignano had, in fact, himself voiced similar fears, but he and his fellow missionaries in Japan were so firmly convinced of the necessity of the most far-reaching adaptation that even the general's apprehensions could not deter them. However, the first chapter of the draft was revised and a number of safeguards were adopted so as to forstall any possible dangers. In his apology to the general, Valignano pointed out that such a complete adaptation as outlined in his manuscript meant so many sacrifices on the part of the missionaries that the danger of pride was thereby more than neutralized.

If Vilignano's bold program of adaptation in this way met with criticism within the Society of Jesus, it is but natural that other religious orders would approve of it even less. As a matter of fact, the other orders often did accuse the Jesuits of pride and arrogance, saying that they went about as grand seigneurs with a suite of servants and dependents. It was to forstall such criticism that Valignano tried to keep other religious orders out of Japan until the time when the Church would be firmly established.

Father Schütte in a very learned introduction has given the historical background and the genesis of Valignano's interesting ceremonial. In editing the original text he has made accessible a most interesting source of Japanese cultural history. In missiology Valignano's ceremonial would seem to be one of the boldest steps ever taken in the direction of the much-talked about adaptation.

JOHN LAURES

Catholic University of Tokyo

Storia dell'introduzione del cristianismo in Cina. [Fonti Ricciane.] Edite e commentate da Pasquale M. D'Elia, S.I. Volume I. (Roma: La Libreria della Stato. 1942. Pp. clxxxvii, 386. 1200 lire.)

On May 14, 1613, Nicholas Trigault sailed from Macao for Rome. He sailed under orders of Nicholò Longobardo, Matteo Ricci's successor as superior of the Jesuits in China, to visit Europe in the interests of the Chinese mission. In the mind of Longobardo, not the least important purpose of Trigault's mission was to deliver to the General of the Society

of Jesus the manuscript of Ricci's own *Storia dell'introduzione del cristianismo in Cina.*

Where others had failed, Ricci had succeeded in opening China to the western world after the lapse of two centuries since the disappearance of the Franciscan mission of the Middle Ages. From his entry into China in 1582 until his death in 1610 he labored with heroic patience, admirable skill, rare intelligence, inexhaustible charity, to establish firmly the foundations of the Church in China. His was one of the truly great achievements in the missionary annals of the Church. The *Storia dell'introduzione del cristianismo in Cino,* written in 1609, was Ricci's own account of his experiences during nearly thirty years in China. It is the primary source for the history of the founding of the Church in China as well as for the history of inter-cultural relations between East and West. It is an invaluable source for the study of the Chinese political and social milieu of the time. It is indispensable to an understanding of the methods of apostolate adopted by the Jesuits in China.

In 1615 Trigault, who had arrived in Rome in the latter days of 1614, published his own Latin translation of Ricci's *Storia* under the title *De christiana expeditione apud Sinas.* It enjoyed sensational success. It went through five editions in Latin and within ten years had appeared in French, German, Spanish, Italian, and partially in English.

Unfortunately, Trigault had taken considerable liberty with Ricci's original Italian text with the result that the translation suffered from many errors, omissions, and additions. While Trigault's defective version found its way into most libraries in the world Ricci's original manuscript lay buried in the Jesuit archives in Rome until 1911 when, together with a volume of Ricci's letters, it was published by the eminent Jesuit historian, Pietro Tacchi Venturi. The two volumes bore the general title *Opere storiche del P. Matteo Ricci, S.I.*

This publication stimulated new and widespread interest both in China and outside of China in this incomparable source material. In view of the fact that Tacchi Venturi was in no sense a Sinologist, his editing of Ricci's manuscript and letters was a notable achievement. But for the same reason it suffered from grievous defects. The numerous persons, places, and events mentioned by Ricci could not be identified without recourse to Chinese sources and the editor was not equipped for this task. Chinese names and words appear in Ricci's text only in the Italian phonetizations which he invented for the purpose of approximately rendering Chinese sounds in Roman letters. In reading Ricci's text in the Tacchi Venturi edition the student is constantly tormented by the desire to identify precisely the people whom Ricci met and to know more about them.

Some years ago Pasquale D'Elia, eminent Jesuit Sinologist, undertook the immense task of remedying these defects in a new and complete edi-

tion of all Ricci's works. The present volume is the first to appear in a series which, when completed, will include, in addition to Ricci's history of the introduction of Christianity in China (in two volumes of which that here under review is the first), his letters, his Chinese works, the letters of his fellow Jesuit missionaries, the official annual reports of the Chinese mission of that time, the miscellanies, a scholarly biography of Ricci, and a volume of detailed indices of the whole series.

The present volume is proof that the task Father D'Elia has set himself is enormous and that he is brilliantly equipped to carry it through successfully. Prodigious is the only word that aptly describes the character of the research which Father D'Elia has carried on in the immense field of Chinese literature. The fruits are evident on every page, in the Chinese characters identifying persons, places, and titles, in erudite and instructive footnotes, in extensive biographical sketches of the personages mentioned by Ricci, and in comments of interest to Sinologist, enthnologist, and historian.

It is going to be difficult to wait with patience for the appearance of the subsequent volumes in this series. In paying tribute to Father D'Elia for a truly monumental piece of work, this reviewer adds a prayer that nothing will prevent him from carrying his appointed task to final completion.

GEORGE H. DUNNE

Loyola University
Los Angeles

Correspondence de Jansénius, I. *Les Origines du Jansénisme*. Par Jean Orcibal. (Louvain: Bureaux de la Revue. Bibliothèque de la Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique, Fasc. 25. 1947. Pp. xxvi, 647.)

This volume contains the full text of 172 letters of Jansenius to Saint-Cyran, forty-eight letters of Jansenius to others, and twenty-two other documents, principally letters to, or about, Jansenius. The letters to Saint-Cyran form the important part of the publication and, since the letters of Saint-Cyran seem to have perished, they are the fundamental documents for the pre-history of Jansenism. They are not only among the most fateful but also the queerest letters which ever passed between human beings. Jansenius in them is the most mysterious of mystery men, hesitating to call anyone or anything, immediately concerned, by name, sometimes going so far as to use two grotesque pseudonyms for the same personage in successive lines. Aside from their importance for the history of Jansenism these letters have little interest but from that viewpoint they merit the most careful study.

With insignificant exceptions, M. Orcibal was able to make his edition on the autographs, which have had a curious history. When Saint-Cyran

was arrested by order of Richelieu in May, 1638, his letters, with the exception of twenty-two which remained in the hands of the Jansenists, were seized and passed into the possession of the magistrate in charge of the process, Martin de Laubardemont. When Saint-Cyran was liberated, Cardinal Richelieu ordered that his papers be returned to him. For some reason the letters remained in possession of Laubardemont, and, most probably after his death in 1653, they were given by his family to the French Jesuits. In the same year, the controversy between the Jesuits and Jansenists being then at its height, François Pinthereau printed extracts from 131 of the letters and from other letters having to do with the origins of Jansenism. The originals of the letters were at the same time deposited in the Jesuit college at Paris so that the omissions could be controlled. The Jansenists of the time complained, however, that they were not allowed to examine them. When Gabriel Gerberon, who was very devoted to the cause of the Jansenists, made a new edition of the letters in 1702, he reproduced Pinthereau's edition. This partial edition remained the primary source for the origin of Jansenism and historians concluded with regret that the original letters had been lost.

Fortunately, the very collection of the originals, used by Pinthereau, has been preserved in the Vatican Library, having been taken to Italy by a Jesuit at the time of the expulsion of the French Jesuits. It is this collection, together with all other letters of Jansenius which are at present known to survive, which M. Orcibal publishes. The edition leaves little to be desired and has been furnished with an adequate introduction and voluminous notes. The editor has taken pains to point out in each instance what Père Pinthereau omitted especially, long and often inexact passages of gossip on contemporary politics and military operations and much which bears witness to Jansenius' aversion for Calvinism as well as to the teaching of Marco Antonio de Dominis.

This volume is the first in a series of five on the origins of Jansenism of which two on Saint-Cyran are ready and one on Jansenius is soon to appear. Certainly all historians interested will welcome these volumes since there is great need of a full treatment of the subject which will avoid the exaggerations of Pinthereau and Sainte-Beuve alike.

EDWARD A. RYAN

Woodstock College

Difficult Star. The Life of Pauline Jaricot. By KATHERINE BURTON. (New York: Longmans, Green & Co. 1947. Pp. x, 239. $2.75.)

Katherine Burton has presented another of her inspiring biographies, *Difficult Star.* It is probably the most informative book she has published since her *Sorrow Built a Bridge.* Pauline Jaricot was one of the many

extraordinary lay persons whose sanctity and zeal did so much for France and the world during the nineteenth century. Mrs. Burton portrays the hopes, aspirations, efforts, and sorrows of "a poor old woman who thought she could save the world." The reader will readily agree that, if Pauline Jaricot partly failed in her plans for the betterment of mankind, she did at least point a way in which her aim might be realized. The world is a better place because she lived.

Pauline Jaricot is not well known to the English-speaking world. Those who have had an interest in her cause, which was introduced in 1930, knew her to be the foundress of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith. That small group knew little else of the life and labor of the woman of Lyons. There has been little information available in English other than Maurin's work of forty years ago and that of Perrin published over twenty years ago. Both were translated into English. Mrs. Burton's work fills a definite need. Missions were not the only interest, nor were they the life work of Miss Jaricot. Her active mind and tender heart were moved by observing conditions around her, the results of the revolution of 1830 and the uprisings in Lyons in 1831 and 1834. These conditions she attempted to change.

A lenten sermon against wordly vanities motivated the seventeen-year-old daughter of one of the richest silk merchants in Lyons to discard her fashionable attire and turn her mind to higher and more enduring things. From that moment she was a model of what today would be referred to as Catholic Action: an apostolate of prayer, sacrifice, and action. Her first effort was mission-minded and "the little sou of Mademoiselle Jaricot" has become a mighty river encircling the world in charity, through the pontifical society which developed from her humble efforts. Her desire to lead France in an act of reparation prompted her to establish the "Living Rosary," which met an immediate response. During the last half of her life she was better known in France as the foundress of this work than as that of the Propagation. In fact she was denied credit for the latter. Her most ambitious undertaking was an effort in behalf of the working man fifty years before the *Rerum Novarum*. Her own inheritance plus what she could secure in loans for this work was lost because of the fraud of those whom she trusted. The plan was good and far in advance of the economic ideas of her day. The encyclicals of Leo XIII, Pius X, and Pius XI contain these ideas.

Among those who understood her and offered to her their friendship and advice were Blessed Peter Eymard, St. Madeleine Sophie Barat, who hoped that her "doves" might, like Pauline, "rise above all the things of earth," St. John Vianney, who said of her, "She knew how to accept the cross—the heaviest cross—with love." Pope Gregory XVI visited her in Rome, when she was unable to leave her sick bed to call on him. Pope

Pius IX interested himself in her difficulties. Undoubtedly, Mrs. Burton's book will find a welcome among the many who have interests in common with those of Pauline Jaricot. It is hoped, too, that it will in some way aid the promotion of the cause of this friend of saints, who prayed, "Lord, give us saints. They alone renew and comfort the earth."

JOSEPH P. RYAN

Maryknoll Seminary

The Christian Churches of the East. Volume I. *Churches in Communion with Rome.* By DONALD ATTWATER. (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. Pp. xiv, 248. $4.00.)

Donald Attwater needs no introduction to students of the Eastern Churches, and this study gives further testimony to his erudition in matters pertaining to the Christian communions of the Near East. The marked tone of restraint in criticism here is a definite improvement over the earlier works and the author gives more and more evidence of a better understanding of the problems which confront Catholics of the Eastern rites. A chart of statistics and general information together with a good index enhance the value of this book.

Many Catholics of the Eastern rites will disagree with Mr. Attwater's insistance on "purism" (pp. 29 ff.). In fact, it seems that he cannot quite make up his mind either. For while he condemns some of these Catholics for "adapting themselves to a European and alien outlook" (p. 29), he does not hesitate to admit (with wholehearted approval) that "the variousness of human temperament has had its profound and legitimate effect on the religious life and worship no less in the East than in the West" (p. 34). It is difficult for this reviewer to see how Eastern Catholics of Central Europe who, from the very beginning of their known history, have come under the influence of European culture can look upon this culture as alien. Aside from Father Cyril Korolevsky, who apparently is the source of the author's information, we know of no other authority who would assert that the hearing of Mass on Sundays and holydays was not *de praecepto* (p. 35). In fact, the contrary seems to be the better opinion at least as far as the Byzantine Church is concerned.

There are other mistakes that should be corrected. Eastern non-Catholics are not only encouraged (p. 14) but, with the exception of the Russians, are bound to return to their own rite. The enumeration of the canons of the Latin Code binding Orientals (p. 22) is not complete. Neither is it true that "Among the Ruthenians these doors are often never shut" (p. 41). The practice whereby "portions of the Host that are to be reserved are all 'annointed' with a drop of the sacred blood" (p. 46) has been condemned by the Holy See. The feast of the Immaculate Con-

ception is not new (p. 55) for it is listed in the *Typikon* of St. Sabbas as early as 485, while the West (with the exception of Naples and Sicily) did not celebrate this feast till the eleventh century. We must disagree likewise with the analysis of the origin of schism among the Carpatho-Ruthenians (p. 89) which was promoted by the Czechoslovak regime. The Administrator of Presov was appointed bishop of that see in 1944, and recently was given an auxiliary. On the other hand Bishop Theodore Romza did not have an auxiliary. We doubt very much whether the bulk of the Carpatho-Ruthenians would agree with Mr. Attwater's statement that "under the Czechoslovak government they fared considerably better than many other minorities in other countries and their state was improving" (p. 90). In view of the importance Russia has come to have in international affairs more space should have been devoted to the trials and successes of Catholic missionary efforts among the Russians at home and abroad. The disciplinary and liturgical canons of the Melkite synod held at Ain-Traz in 1835, which are opposed to provisions enacted by the Holy See prior to that date, were not approved.

It is this reviewer's personal conviction that any work such as this, which attempts to discuss all the Churches of the East under one general title is inherently weak. Despite the common name we use to designate these Churches, in many instances they are as divergent among themselves as are the Churches of Constantinople and Rome. This, in fact, is also admitted by the author. Notwithstanding these deficiencies we can heartily recommend this book to all who wish to broaden their knowledge of the Catholic Church and to gain a bird's eyeview of the Catholic Near East.

STEPHEN C. GULOVICH

Pittsburgh Ordinariate
of the
Byzantine-Slavonic Rite

AMERICAN CHURCH HISTORY

Evocation de Junípero Serra. Fondateur de la Californie. By CHARLES J. G. MAXIM PIETTE, O.F.M. (Washington: Academy of American Franciscan History. 1946. Pp. 439. Cloth $4.00; paper $2.50.)

On March 1, 1931, the State of California unveiled in the national Capitol the statue of perhaps her greatest hero, Junípero Serra. It was this likeness which some eight years later inspired Father Piette to gather the materials—by no means a small task—for the critical biographical study which he now presents to the historical world.

The co-founder and apostle of California was born in Petra, Majorca, November 24, 1713. Entering the Franciscan Order in 1730, he did his

philosophy and theology at St. Francis Friary, Palma. In the immediate years after his ordination he distinguished himself as a professor of philosophy and as a pulpit orator, but there burned in his heart a desire for missionary work. This desire was realized in 1749 when he embarked with a small band of Franciscan missionaries for the College of San Fernando, Mexico City. In hastening to the harvest from the port of Vera Cruz he incurred a poisonous bite on the foot, a painful wound which remained with him until death, hindering but by no means preventing almost incredible journeys by foot. The first nine years of his missionary life were spent among the Indians of Sierra Gorda. Then, after a few years of priestly work at the capital of New Spain, he was sent as superior of the Fernandinos who replaced the Jesuits in Lower California. Two years later he was on his way with Portolà to establish the first missions and presidios in Alta California. During the remaining fifteen years of his life he labored unceasingly among the Indians of this new Spanish outpost. His work, although marked by keen disappointment, was crowned ultimately with consoling success. Under his guidance the padres founded nine of California's twenty-one missions and some 6000 natives were led to a spiritual and material prosperity. Father Serra died suddenly in 1784 and was buried in the mission most dear to him—El Carmel, Monterey. The secret of this hero's life, Father Piette states, was his success in directing his whole life toward a perfect love of God and neighbor (p. 41). This observation is of particular interest because of some disagreement among historians concerning the cause of Serra's frequent controversies with the secular authorities, particularly, Governors Fages and Neve. The author points out in this regard that the quarrels of the president of the missions were in line of duty and were always tempered by that same charity, above all in the case of Fages (p. 84).

For many years Californians have looked forward hopefully to the day when this, their great missionary, will be canonized. Some years ago Eric O'Brien, O.F.M., was designated vice-postulator in behalf of Father Serra, and the Bishop of Monterey-Fresno appointed to the requisite historical commission Maynard Geiger, O.F.M., Monsignor James H. Culleton, and the distinguished Professor Herbert E. Bolton, a non-Catholic keenly interested in the father of the missions. These scholars have labored arduously in finding and gathering documentary materials. It is understood that their work in this respect nears completion. It is, therefore, somewhat of a surprise to note the appearance of the volume under consideration. The author, although no doubt a very distinguished Franciscan scholar, is a European with no apparent connection with the commission, and the volume itself appears neither in English nor in Spanish, but in French. The work, however, which, as the author notes, did have

the assistance of Fathers O'Brien and Geiger is of great merit and leaves little room for adverse criticism. The style of the author is somewhat imaginative at times (pp. 21-25), and occasionally tends toward exaggeration (p. 41), but with little or no effect on his judgments. All in all, the work must be adjudged as thorough in an Old World way, scholarly in its use of abundant documents, helpful to historians with its splendid bibliography, its chronological list of the writings of Serra, its inclusion of the newly discovered, more accurate journal of the padre. Beyond doubt it is the most definitive of the works that have appeared thus far on the founder of the California missions.

TIMOTHY J. CASEY

Serra High School
San Mateo

Chahta-Ima. The Life of Adrien-Emmanuel Rouquette. By DAGMAR RENSHAW LEBRETON. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 1947. Pp. xix, 442. $4.00.)

It is a long time since the literature of American Catholic history has been enriched by so engaging a biography of an American ecclesiastic as Mrs. Lebreton has given us in the volume under review. The author, associate professor of French in Newcomb College of Tulane University in New Orleans, has performed her task with careful scholarship and thorough coverage of the extent sources. The reader can easily agree that the first of her two-fold aims in writing the book has been attained when she says that she had in mind "contributing a chapter to the story of American civilization and at the same time initiating the rehabilitation of Louisiana nineteenth-century French writers" (p. xix). Whether the latter aim will be fulfilled remains to be seen, but we might say that this study deserves to rank as a good starter in such a rehabilitation of Louisiana's literary figures of the past century.

The subject of Mrs. Lebreton's biography was born in New Orleans on February 26, 1813, and died in the same city on July 15, 1887. His life, therefore, spanned most of the nineteenth century. Adrien-Emmanuel Rouquette was educated at the Collège d'Orléans in New Orleans, Transylvania University in Kentucky, and at the Collège Royal of Nantes, France. His studies in France brought him into contact with Lamennais and Lacordaire and the young American was deeply influenced by these leaders of French Catholicism at that time. The young lad made repeated trips to France from the time he was fifteen, and after an attempt at law which he failed—much to his delight—he turned his attention toward the priesthood. In this search for his life work he was assisted in his decision by Abbé Napoleon J. Perché, one of the most colorful characters in Louisiana Catholic history. With Abbé Perché as his counselor he en-

tered St. Vincent de Paul Seminary at Plattenville, Louisiana, late in 1842. He was ordained by Bishop Blanc on July 2, 1845. The dream entertained by Blanc for the young priest, that he should be his secretary and remain in New Orleans to assist in the work of the ministry in the growing city, met a stubborn obstacle in Rouquette's insistence on solitude and his need for the quiet life of the bayous and the forests.

Surely Rouquette was no ordinary fellow. He had a passion for nature which was so strong that he could not be happy for long in the bustle and noise of New Orleans. When some well-intentioned friends cut down the trees at the Nook, one of his forest homes, with the idea of using the timber to repair his dwelling the priest was so distraught that he wrote an impassioned denunciation of their stupidity and lack of feeling for these giants of nature that would probably have dismayed the tree choppers did they ever read it (pp. 257-258). But it was no selfish love of nature that brought Father Rouquette to Bayou Lacombe and his other missionary cabins and chapels. He had likewise a profound love for the Indians. So successful was he in winning the hearts of the suspicious Choctaws that they named him "Chahta-Ima," meaning Choctaw-like. It was a favorite name with the priest and he prided himself on the affectionate impulse that prompted it in the minds of his redmen.

A great deal of Mrs. Lebreton's space is given to an analysis of Rouquette's many writings both in verse and prose. While she is careful to convey to her reader a just appraisal of the merits of the priest's literary efforts she is never guilty of attempting to pass them off as great literature. The themes of his poems and essays were most frequently nature and the Indians, but he likewise devoted a great deal of time and talent to singing the glories of America. The approach of the Civil War found Rouquette thoroughly aroused to the danger confronting his beloved America and—showing that he was a man of strong conviction—when the crisis came he did not hesitate to make it known that he was for the federal Union and against secession. In this he differed with his old priestly mentor, for Abbé Perché, editor of *Propagateur catholique*, was so stoutly a secessionist that when New Orleans was occupied by federal troops he was put under house arrest and his weekly newspaper suspended. Rouquette's alarm over the ominous growth of the slavery controversy occasioned him to promote the American Party in 1855, and we find the strange spectacle of a Catholic priest in New Orleans backing the Know-Nothings in their attempt to gain public office (pp. 187-188). It need hardly be said that Father Rouquette did this in good conscience since he felt that it would best insure the stifling of division between the North and the South, and not out of any sympathy for the Know-Nothings' virulent hatred of the Catholic Church. There were two wings of the party in Louisiana and there were other Catholics besides Rouquette who promoted

the party's fortunes until its true character was shown and made it impossible for them to lend it further support.

Naturally Mrs. Lebreton is chiefly interested in Rouquette as a writer and in this her emphasis is, of course, quite legitimate. However, historians will wish that she had given a bit more of the ecclesiastical and secular history of the times in which her subject lived. In spots it will be difficult for the reader unfamiliar with the historical development of those years to fit Rouquette into the events of his day. But it should be repeated that her research has been thorough and conscientious and she has made good use of the manuscript material in the archives of the University of Notre Dame (which is called Notre Dame University throughout), the Archdiocese of New Orleans, the John Minor Wisdom collection, and the manuscripts of the Howard-Tilton Memorial Library at Tulane University. The author's "Critical Essay on Authorities" (p. 399-416) is excellent. The book also contains an appendix which gives a chronological bibliography of Rouquette's writings, a good index, and ten interesting illustrations done by Mrs. Lebreton herself.

The reviewer noted a few slips. The name of the archivist of the University of Notre Dame, one of the advisory editors of this REVIEW, is McAvoy, not McEvoy (p. xiii); Archbishop Blanc was "installed" and not "consecrated" in 1851 (p. 89, n. 1); the action of the *Propagateur catholique* in 1845 was against the Nativists and not the Know-Nothings (p. 98, n. 20); the letters designating the Congregation of the Holy Cross are C.S.C., not V.S.C. (p. 101, n. 25); the letter of Rouquette to Blanc from Le Havre was 1846, not 1856 (p. 118, n. 23); Joseph (not F.) Finotti became literary editor of the Boston *Pilot* in 1858, so he could hardly have been the author in 1848 of the notice in that paper of Rouquette's *Wild Flowers* (p. 131, n. 46); Finotti became a priest of the Diocese of Boston only in 1852. The First Plenary Council of Baltimore was held in 1852, not 1851 (p. 185), and is it a literary license that prompts Mrs. Lebreton to speak of Rouquette "worshiping" Admiral Farragut (p. 230)?

These are but minor points, however, in a very good book and their listing here should not mislead one to believe that Mrs. Lebreton's work has been in the main anything but careful and searching. In fact, this reviewer is conscious that he has not done her volume full justice, for what of Rouquette's interesting relations with Father Isaac Hecker, his correspondence with Holmes, Bryant, Thoreau, and others of America's literary great? Nonetheless he must bow to the inexorable limitations of space which this review entails and leave the many other worthwhile features of Mrs. Lebreton's fine biography of this unusual Louisiana priest to the readers who will peruse her pages.

JOHN TRACY ELLIS

The Catholic University of America

Free Religion: An American Faith. By STOW PERSONS. (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1947. Pp. v, 168. $3.00.)

In this slender volume Stow Persons endeavors to study the development of non-transcendentalist Unitarian thought in the period immediately following the Civil War. Specifically he treats of an effort of the old Unitarians to reform their lines after the defection of the Transcendentalists and the further rejection of the reforming movement towards union of Unitarians into a distinct sect by the Association of Free Religion. The sub-title, "An American Faith," is a bit misleading insofar as the group never agreed on a body of doctrine and had little in common with the American thought of their day. Few readers will share the author's enthusiasm for his subject because of its very formlessness. At no time could the members of the sect, if it can be called that, agree on even their fundamental tenets and it is difficult to see why they called their faith religion because their one tenet was freedom from that notion of obligation to God which is the very essence of religion.

The more interesting portion of Dr. Person's account deals with the beginnings of the movement, where he points out that the leaders felt that they were fully consistent with the old New England theology. Had he filled out this picture with more details from the social and political history of New England, he would have given a worthwhile contribution to the history of the religious mind of late nineteenth-century New England. Actually, Persons speaks of a small group, much smaller probably than the Transcendentalists, but because they were at the core of the evolution of the New England religious mind of the nineteenth century they are quite significant. Persons claims far too great an influence for his handful of writers and preachers of whom he gives little personal detail. All American Protestantism was undergoing a similar development and for the same reason: because the doctrine of private interpretation and religious individualism inherent in English Protestantism provides no limit or guiding principle for that development.

Dr. Persons gives considerable importance to Darwinism and Spencerian sociology in the movement towards "free religion," but he does not distinguish between cause and effect. The rise of individualism, the lowered ideals of education during the "Gilded Age," and the westward movement of population away from the old communities created problems for which "free thought" had no solution except surrender. Dr. Persons' story could be retold from another angle to show how by this evolution a religious group has been able to retain the name of religion while surrendering every distinctive characteristic of religious thought. Further, as

Dr. Persons failed to point out, such "free religion" had no program for the solution of the modern social problems with which the surviving religious organizations are now struggling.

THOMAS T. MCAVOY

University of Notre Dame

Thomas Edward Shields: Biologist, Psychologist, Educator. By JUSTINE WARD. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1947. Pp. xv, 309. $3.50.)

In a brief review of Cassidy's revision of McCormick's *History of Education,* published in *School and Society,* the author comments unfavorably on the fact that the book devotes a whole chapter to Dr. Shields while making no mention of Archbishop Hughes, Bishop Spalding, or Mother Seton. If he happens to come across Mrs. Ward's work, he will no doubt be surprised to learn that Shields has been made the subject of a full-length biography which aims to establish the right of this university professor to recognition as the foremost leader of Catholic education during the first quarter of the twentieth century.

The story of Shields' career is fairly well known to the majority of present-day Catholic teachers. They are familiar with the account he himself has left of his triumphant struggle to overcome the handicap of illiteracy which he suffered until late in his teens as a result of the misunderstanding (or was it the stupidity?) of his family and his early teachers. They may be inclined to question the facts as presented in this narrative and they will certainly take issue with the explanation of the author's intellectual rebirth; but when it comes to a consideration of the work accomplished by the awakened "dullard" in a period of less than twenty-five years, there is no room for doubt, but only for admiration and esteem. Such abiding institutions as the Catholic University of America's Department of Education, the Catholic Sisters College, the Catholic Education Press, and the *Catholic Educational Review,* all of which owe their existence to the zeal and foresight of this intrepid pioneer, are sufficient to justify his claim to a place of honor on the roll of American Catholic educators.

All of these ventures were taken in spite of adverse criticism and, sometimes, of unconcealed opposition. That they survived the storm and have continued to serve so admirably the cause of Catholic education is sufficient proof of the wisdom of the man who launched them. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said of the methods of teaching religion which Dr. Shields introduced. Here the opposition was stronger and to a certain degree well founded. Shields was certainly right in denouncing the then prevalent method of teaching religion—by having the children memorize

the questions and answers of the catechism—and in his contention that religion could be more effectively correlated with the other subjects of the curriculum. The improvement in this respect, which is characteristic of a growing number of Catholic schools, amply supports his stand, although even yet there are some teachers for whom the *Baltimore Catechism* is second only to the revealed Word of God. Where the distinguished educator failed was in the effort to provide satisfactory textbooks and manuals for the application of his theories. A common criticism of the series of texts he published was that only a teacher trained by himself could use them to advantage. He realized this after a while and planned to prepare a revision, but his untimely death left the task unfinished.

All this story and much more of historical interest, with many a sidelight on the character of her subject and of other important personages—university officials, priests, and bishops—with whom he was associated, is told in a thoroughly charming way by Mrs. Ward. She combines a facile style with a factual presentation of source material, which makes for agreeable reading. It is true that her admiration for Dr. Shields, with whom she collaborated for many years, is apparent on every page; but, on the whole, she has pictured the man and his work in a fairly objective light. She has made Catholic educators of today and tomorrow her debtors by bringing to their attention one of the leaders who paved the way for the recognition that Catholic schools at all levels now enjoy.

EDWARD B. JORDAN

The Catholic University of America

Wartime Correspondence between President Roosevelt and Pope Pius XII. Introduction and Explanatory Notes by MYRON C. TAYLOR. (New York: Macmillan Co. 1947. Pp. xiii, 127. $2.50.)

An important addition to the diplomatic literature of World War II is the *Wartime Correspondence between President Roosevelt and Pope Pius XII.* It is evidently not a complete record of the corespondence, reports, and aid-memoirs which passed between the two. It is sufficiently explicit and full to specify clearly the fundamental policies on war and peace of both the White House and the Vatican. We are indebted to Mr. Myron C. Taylor, the personal representative of the President to His Holiness, for compiling and annotating, in an interesting fashion, these very important documents.

First of all, and of historical meaning, is the reason given by the President for initiating these *pourparlers* between himself and the Pope. Roosevelt had "invited" the leaders of the Protestant and Jewish faiths resident in the United States, to come to Washington from time to time to discuss with him personally. To His Holiness in Rome, with whom

personal exchanges of views were possible only through correspondence and a trusted intermediary, he suggested sending a personal representative to act as a channel of communication and an instrument of similar discussions (p. 3). In his first letter to the Pope the President wrote, "I trust that all of the churches of the world which believe in a common God will throw the great weight of their influence into this great cause" (p. 19). And to implement the matter as far as world-wide Catholicism was concerned he wrote, "I am suggesting to Your Holiness that it would give me great satisfaction to send to you my personal representative in order that our parallel endeavors for peace and the alleviation of suffering may be assisted" (p. 19).

These activities of Mr. Taylor began at the end of 1939. Their fundamental purpose was to prevent, if possible, the breaking out of war, which eventually, as everyone foresaw, would become world-wide. When the war spread to Russia, the President was quite anxious about how the large and influential Catholic American body would react. He knew of the papal condemnation of communism by Pius XI, and was much perturbed that this condemnation might be carried over to the Russian people, causing a serious rift between allies, to the great disadvantage of the common war-effort. The Pope quickly assured President Roosevelt that the Catholic Church, while it is unalterably opposed to communism, was not against the Russian people, and would do nothing to harm their chance of ultimate victory over the Nazi aggressor (p. 63).

When the war spread to Italy, and threatened Rome itself with destruction, the Holy Father quite naturally appealed to President Roosevelt to see to it that the allies would respect the neutral status of the Vatican City State, would do nothing to destroy, or even injure, the priceless monuments which Rome possesses, and would treat the Italian people with that consideration which they deserved because of their true position *vis-à-vis* the contestants. The letter of the Pope on this subject is very moving (p. 89). The response of the President (p. 91) is exactly what one would expect from a war leader who was motivated by a deep sense of justice and not of vengeance, who was prepared to do all within his power to confine within the narrowest limits the ravages of war, to protect churches, schools, and the artistic products of western civilization.

Over and above these matters of the highest political and international importance, the letters outline the organization of Italian War Relief, in which the Vatican and Mr. Taylor played all-important roles. If the Taylor mission had accomplished nothing more than the organization of this war relief it would have been well worthwhile. That splendid work has left behind it, in the memory of the Italian people, a high and precious regard for the all-embracing charity of the great American people.

This volume is an unanswerable reply to the religious propagandists who are moving heaven and earth to confuse the American public on the true meaning of the mission of Mr. Taylor to the Pope.

JAMES H. RYAN
Archbishop of Omaha

GENERAL HISTORY

The Papacy and World Peace. A Study of the Christmas Messages of Pope Pius XII. By GUIDO GONELLA. Translated by past and present students of the Venerable English College. Edited and abridged by A. C. F. Beales and Andrew Beck, A.A. (London: Hollis and Carter. 1945. Pp. xxi, 214. 12 s. 6 d.)

In 1944 T. Lincoln Bouscaren, S.J., translated into English Guido Gonella's widely acclaimed *Presupposti di un ordine internazionale*—an interesting and illuminating analysis of Pius XII's Christmas messages for 1939, 1940, and 1941. Entitled in English, *A World to Reconstruct: Pius XII on Peace and Reconstruction*, this book was sponsored by the American Bishops' Committee on the Pope's Peace Points and was favorably received, although strangely enough it was never reviewed in the *Catholic Historical Review*. The present volume is another English translation of the same Italian original, made by students of the Venerable English College and edited and abridged by A. C. F. Beales and Andrew Beck, A.A. In one way it is tragic that scholars in England and the United States spent their precious time translating the same book when so many outstanding titles in foreign languages still await an English version. But considered from another viewpoint this new translation will complement the American edition. The students of the English College have rendered a very free and idiomatic translation which dispenses with much of the Italian rhetoric not readily appreciated by English readers. It is, therefore, much easier to read than the American edition and ought to be more popular with the general public. On the other hand, Father Bouscaren's translation is so faithful to the original that it will appeal to scholars who seek the exact wording of Gonella's text.

There are two general divisions in the work: first, "The Reform of International Conduct" and secondly, "Reconstruction of an International Order." In Part One the author studies the five victories proposed in the 1940 Christmas message: victory over hatred, over mistrust, over utilitarianism, over economic injustice, over national egoism. Then proceeding to an examination of the 1939 and 1941 Christmas messages he considers the liberty and integrity of nations; the protection of minorities;

economic co-operation among nations; the practicality of genuine disarmament; the need for an international juridical organization backed by collective force which will guarantee the observance of treaties and their revision when necessary; and finally the obligation of observing the moral law in international relations.

Within the limits of this review it is obviously impossible even to summarize Gonella's detailed explanation of each one of these papal peace points. But by means of a few pertinent citations let me demonstrate the importance of this book for solving the current crisis.

Today this volume is more valuable than when it was first published in Rome. At that time the war was still in progress and there were not a few prominent leaders who were vigorously proclaiming that military victory was the prime requisite for peace. Now, perhaps, these benighted individuals can realize their error. It is already two years since V-J Day and yet the world beholds no real peace, chiefly because the victors have neglected the principles of international justice and charity enuntiated by Pius XII and explained at length by Gonella. One of the victors, Soviet Russia, respects force—and naked, brute force alone. Is not Stalin purported to have said at Yalta. "The Pope, how many divisions has he?" But even the western powers share in the blame for the present muddle because in constituting the United Nations they refused to set up real "juridical institutions, that is, institutions imposing legal obligations" (p. 170), have declined to accept "compulsory arbitration" (p. 185), have failed to see "the obligation of limiting their sovereignity" (p. 187)—all directives of Christian morality proposed by the Pope in the early years of the war.

To foreign observers sometimes our country in her international relations appears to assume the position of the Pharisee in the Gospel: O God. I give thee thanks that I am not as the rest of men, extortioners, unjust, etc. Those Americans who have an inclination to look down upon foreign lands should read Gonella on economic co-operation between nations: "The nations blessed by nature seek to strengthen the position they have acquired. By restricting or prohibiting immigration, by preferential tariffs, by employing a subtle financial technique, by permitting liberty of action to private monopolistic interests . . . these privileged countries strive to consolidate their possessions" (p. 99). If only our congressmen and senators could be persuaded to read this book before they arose to propose legislation detrimental to our national welfare and world peace, how many blunders could be avoided!

To those pessimists who see the inevitability of a third world war, Gonella could write in the midst of the last conflict: "Man's nature is a fallen nature, and that is the reason for the injustices which stain the pages of history. We do not deny the injustices of the past, present or

future. We only maintain that man can improve his conduct, and that injustices among the nations can be corrected, by a general raising of the level of human conduct" (p. 125). Raising the level of human conduct is precisely the task confronting Christians at this moment. One of the most intelligent ways to face this responsibility is to read this basic, brilliant, and inspiring explanation of the moral foundations for international peace.

HARRY C. KOENIG

St. Mary of the Lake Seminary
Mundelein

Systematic Politics. By CHARLES E. MERRIAM. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1945. Pp. xiii, 348. $3.75.)

After many years of shrewd if not exactly serious thinking, Professor Merriam has reached a conclusion that is less obvious to a certain type of intellectual than it is to the man in the street. The conclusion is simply that politics is a practical affair and not a speculative affair. Mr. Merriam is in fact so convinced on this point that he simply refuses to leave anything out of account in systematic politics. Free will is an assumption which he finds more convenient to accept than not (p. 60), and, therefore, you see, the systematic character of politics means including everything you ever heard of and never heard of. There is no doubt that this manner of understanding political science has a clear advantage over the sterile conceptions of legalists and formalists—the analytical school. At the same time Mr. Merriam's treatment reminds one of the pioneer investigations of the early Greeks because, although the Greeks were beginning and Mr. Merriam is concluding, both they and he leave nothing out of account. But there is a great difference between beginning an investigation and concluding one. Leaving nothing out of account is important always at the beginning stage of any investigation; but to conclude in this manner would seem to require, if the reader is not to be left in complete bewilderment, an explanation of what "systematic" means. Mr. Merriam ought to have explained to the readers of his informative and rangey book why he thought that his encyclopedic approach was systematic; for that is, indeed, one of the things about which the reader is likely not to have heard.

Although Mr. Merriam more than once touches upon the relation of moral science to social science there is no treatment of this problem. There is, on the contrary, a suggestion which runs through the entire book that social science (experimental or empirical) has simply taken the place of moral science. For example, Mr. Merriam says:

> In the older terminology there were good men and bad men; there were just and unjust; . . . In later terms there are introverts and extroverts; . . . there are those with mother and father complexes; . . . there are sadists and masochists; there are narcissists and exhibitionists; . . . acid and alkali types. . . ." (p. 2).

The implication is not clear (you are not to expect that), but the impression is given that we cannot today properly speak of bad men and good men, just men and unjust men.

Whatever it is, the systematic politics of Professor Merriam has curious vagaries. Having chided Aristotle for unscholarliness in holding the doctrine of natural slavery, Mr. Merriam has no trouble in declaring for himself that "I am assuming the indefinite perfectibility of men. I am assuming the validity of continuing creative evolution of mankind in the direction of higher levels of the physical, intellectual and spiritual" (p. vii). And in more than one purple patch of heavy religiosity having prophesied a scientific civilization "where leaders no longer scream and curse and threaten and where men no longer shuffle, cringe, and fear but stand erect in dignity and liberty and speak with calm voices of what clear eyes may see," Mr. Merriam also allows that scientific advances have produced "an increased sureness of insight . . . into the factors of human psychology which are operating to produce the present stage of man's inhumanity to man." Too many acid types, no doubt.

The fact is that Mr. Merriam is too religious—in precisely the sense which St. Paul used when, upon the Areopagus, he accused his Greek hearers of being too religious. Mr. Merriam proclaims a new heaven and a new earth. Let us close with his prayer:

> Long ago we were warned against putting new wine into old bottles. Out of the ferment of modern reason, science, education, organization, and technology there will emerge new shapes and spirits of cooperation and control, with new institutions and values, serving a new civilization. We know that we enter an era of creative evolution. . . . In the day when this new world to which we come is generally seen and understood—in that day, etc.

CHARLES N. R. MCCOY

St. Louis University

MEDIAEVAL HISTORY

Charlemagne et L'empire carolingien. Par LOUIS HALPHEN, professeur à la Sorbonne. [Coll. L'Évolution de l'Humanité, n. 33.] (Paris: Editions Albin Michel, 1947. Pp. xxvi, 532. 600 frs.)

It is not, indeed, without significance that an epoch which has seen Europe intent upon the problems of international order, has found the French historical guild busying itself with the national past to consider

anew that Carolingian empire which was Europe's first effort to fashion a state co-terminous with western Christendom. Perhaps Joseph Calmette's *Charlemagne. Sa vie et son oeuvre,* (Paris, 1945) came too soon and was lost sight of in the bold hopes of 1945. Now, at least, when the public is less sanguine of the future, and presumably more amenable to the lessons of the past, it is presented with a substantial work which surveys the entire undertaking of *la deuxième race,* from Pepin's kingdom in the 750's to the breakup of the empire at the close of the ninth century, and which essays an explanation of those elements which made for the strength of the state and those which foreshadowed its failure.

There can be no question but that Professor Halphen has given us a study penetrating in insight, clear in exposition, and with the touch of artistry in expression. Strictly, this is neither a biography of Charlemagne nor an exhaustive analysis of his reign and of those that went before and after in the style of the *Jahrbücher;* rather is it an attempt so to tell the story of the Carolingian experiment as to focus attention upon the politico-religious concepts which were at once the goal toward which it worked and the motive force which drove it. And its purpose has been well achieved. Yet in the nature of the case, only one part of the story has been told and only one facet of the undertaking has been caught. Whole fields of social, economic, and ecclesiastical history remain untilled. Even in matters well within the author's scope there are at times evident omissions; note, e.g., the scant treatment that is given the functioning of the imperial chancery (p. 159) in comparison with what J. de Font-Réaulx, not mentioned in the bibliography, has had to say in the *Journal des Savants,* "La chancellerie carolingienne d'après des publications recentes." (July-Sept. 1944), 122-135.

Errors of detail have crept in on occasion. Terracina lies 101 kilometers from Rome, not thirty-eight as here stated (p. 418); and in the spring of 877, Charles the Bald was completing his fifty-fourth year rather than his fifty-second (p. 432). It is not quite correct to say that Erich Caspar's *Geschichte des Papsttums,* in its two volumes, "s'arrête au milieu du VIIIe siècle, la suite non parue," (p. 507), when one considers the large segment of the third volume which appeared posthumously as "Das Papsttum unter fränkischer Herrschaft" in the *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte,* 54 (1935), 132-264.

This last oversight calls attention to a certain imperfection in the ten pages of bibliography. Assuredly in the aftermath of war it would be unfair to demand an exhaustive listing of works consulted. Still it is true of Professor Halphen's book that all too few recent German and Anglo-American studies appear therein. Two examples must suffice: on page 110, when speaking of the pledges of Pepin and Charlemagne to the Holy See in 754 and 774—promises, indeed, whose historicity has been denied

by Monsignor Saltet in the Toulouse *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique*, 41 (1940), 176-206; 42 (1941), 61-85—he cites, among German works, only an article of Kehr dating from 1893. Surely mention should have been made of P. E. Schramm's "Das Versprechen Pippins und Karls des Grossen für die römische Kirche," in *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte*, 58 (1938), *Kan. Abt.*, 27, 180-217. And on page 226, where stress is laid upon changes in imperial appellation, one would have expected use of Edmund Stengel's "Kaisertitel und Suveränitätsidee. Studien zur Vorgeschichte des modernen Staatsbegriffs," in *Deutsches Archiv für Geschichte des Mittelalters*, III (1939), 1-56, much of which is devoted to the Carolingian period.

On several points the research of other scholars has already called for modification of Professor Halphen's views. Thus, for example, on page 102, the author refers to an article of his which appeared in the *Revue historique* for 1938 wherein he rejected—and still rejects—as a sixteenth-century forgery one of three sources on the so-called Lombard Plot of 771. But the most recent student of the problem, O. Bertolini in the newly-founded *Rivista di storia della chiesa in Italia*, I (May-August, 1947), 227-262 ("La caduta del primicerio Cristoforo (771) nelle versioni dei contemporanei"), has shown the charge to be without foundation, and he has brilliantly brought out the peculiar significance of this source—a fragment attributed to the secretary of the Bavarian Duke Tassilo III—for a proper understanding of the conspiracy.

Two sections of Halphen's book (pp. 198-206, 486-490) deal with the question of vassalage. But unfortunately the language is much too vague. "Vassal" is employed, as in so many textbooks, to describe all who have entered into a feudal contract of dependence upon a "lord." Recent studies have stressed the need for limiting the term. For "vassals" are only one class among feudal dependents and in the Carolingian period, "whenever vassals are mentioned, no matter whose they are, they regularly appear as fighting men, sharply distinguished by their superior equipment from armed peasants in the royal host." [Carl Stephenson in the *American Historical Review*, XLVI (July, 1941), 803-804]. Unavailable to Halphen at the time of writing, Charles E. Odegaard's book, *Vassi and Fideles in the Carolingian Empire*, (Harvard University Press, 1945), pursued a line of thought adumbrated in *Speculum*, XVI (July, 1941), 284-296, and made clear that if we are to be in accord with ninth-century usage, we must speak of "lords" (or, better, "seniors") and "fideles" rather than of "lords" and "vassals," reserving this latter term for that smaller class among "fideles" who had pledged themselves to the special task of rendering military service to their "seniors."

Apropos of what Professor Halphen has written (pp. 489-490) concerning Hincmar of Rheims' views on the extention of "vassalage" to bishops—

an interpretation which labors under a mistaken meaning set upon "vassals" —this reviewer would note the basic lines of the archbishop's position as he hopes to present them in a forthcoming study: 1) for Hincmar, "vassalage" in the military sense (the only sense wherewith he was acquainted) was regarded as incompatible with the episcopal character; 2) but "fidelity", in its technical meaning, was altogether different. The archbishop has no difficulty with a prelate's being numbered among royal "fideles;" indeed, he expressly brackets himself with the "fideles" of King Charles the Bald. 3) Neither does he raise any objection to a bishop's *commending* himself and his church to the protection of the crown. 4) Yet while he is willing to allow an episcopal *pledge* of fidelity in addition to commendation, he does object strongly to a bishop's being asked to swear an *oath* in confirmation of such fidelity. Thus it is on the sole grounds of the fidelity oath that Hincmar drew a distinction between lay and episcopal "fideles" of the king as "senior."

These comments come to mind upon reading Halphen's book. They are offered simply as constructive criticism of what is clearly a substantial study by a seasoned scholar.

HENRY G. J. BECK

Immaculate Conception Seminary
Darlington

The Ancestry and Life of Godfrey of Bouillon. By JOHN C. ANDRESSOHN. [Indiana University Publications, Social Science Series, No. 5.] (Bloomington: Indiana University Bookstore, 1947. Pp. 136. $1.50.)

The career of Godfrey of Bouillon illustrates two aspects of eleventh century history: feudal Germany and the crusade. A descendant of the counts of Boulogne and designated heir by his uncle, Duke Godfrey the Hunchback of Lower Lorraine, Godfrey of Bouillon lived until his thirty-fifth year the life of a fairly typical magnate of the Holy Roman Empire. More turbulent than some other parts of the empire, the border province of Lower Lorraine needed constant attention. There were frequent dealings with Henry IV, who did not promptly invest the young man with his duchy, and with the clergy both regular and secular. All these were complicated by the current controversy over lay investiture. To this period of Godfrey's life Professor Andressohn has devoted two chapters.

The remaining four chapters trace Godfrey's role on the First Crusade and as the first Latin ruler of Jerusalem. His motives for taking the cross are analyzed. And on this difficult matter the author feels that "rather than religious fervor, it was the example of the princes of northern France that stirred in Godfrey the spirit of adventure, the willingness to give up the 'certain for the uncertain.'" There is an important section dealing with

the disposal of property to raise funds and to equip troops and with the attendant personal and political difficulties. Thereafter the author follows Godfrey across southeastern Europe to the meeting of the leaders at Constantinople. The final three chapters deal with the march across Asia Minor and Syria, the capture of Jerusalem, and Godfrey's short regime in the Holy City where he died in 1100.

Professor Anderssohn has approached his subject from the standpoint of a critical scholar. His work is detailed, and the narrative is occasionally interrupted in order that disputed matters can be adequately discussed. The footnotes are numerous and frequently cite passages of some length. Since, as the author correctly remarks, "it is well-nigh impossible to portray in a specific way the activities and the accomplishments of any individual on the First Crusade," he has let the events give the setting for what biographical material is possible. As a consequence, chapters III-VI constitute perhaps the most detailed treatment of the First Crusade in English.

In his appraisal of Godfrey's character the author has attempted to steer a middle course between those earlier historians who built up the crusader into a legendary hero and the hypercritical investigators of the nineteenth century. But in this, as in all aspects of his subject, the author has not allowed himself to stray far from contemporary documents. Therefore, although the figure of a great crusading leader might, perhaps, have stood out more distinctly from the narrative, it should be remembered that Professor Anderssohn has sought to present a critical monograph rather than a popular biography. In this he has succeeded.

The book contains eight maps prepared by the author, three genealogical tables, two illustrations, bibliography, and index. The statements in chapter VI regarding Godfrey's connection with the early law codes and his relations with the patriarchate of Jerusalem might have been modified after consulting the works of John L. La Monte. There is also some relevant material in the first volume of R. Grousset's *Histoire des Croisades,* and in *The Crusades and other Essays Presented to Dana C. Munro,* edited by L. J. Paetow.

MARSHALL W. BALDWIN

New York University

L'Essor de la littérature latine au XII^e siècle. J. de Ghellinck, S.J. [Museum Lessianum—Section Historique, No. 4.] (Bruxelles: L'Édition Universelle; Paris: Desclée de Brouwer. 1946. 2 Volumes. Pp. viii, 232; 355.)

In 1939 Bloud et Gay published two little volumes on *Littérature latine au moyen âge* in the popular series, Bibliothèque catholique des sciences religieuses. In them the history of mediaeval Latin literature was brought

down to St. Anselm. War conditions seem to have prevented their wide distribution on this side of the Atlantic. This series, without notes and almost without bibliography, scarcely seemed to be the proper vehicle of publication for de Ghellinck's vast scholarship. But by skillfully grouping authors according to time, place, and literary genre he gave welcome aid to readers bewildered by a vast array of names. Though he had to count his words, his intimate knowledge of the authors and his superb control of the bibliography enabled him to write with freshness and originality. One more of such little volumes was to have completed the series on mediaeval Latin literature. The prospect was distressing. Even the twelfth century, in which this veteran scholar is so much at home, had not been touched. The present two sizeable volumes of the Museum Lessianum offer us his treatment of that great century. Again the matter is too vast for the limits imposed by present-day conditions. But he can have no more space. He must write these volumes without explanatory notes. He must whittle his bibliography down to bare essentials and less. It is too bad, when so much good paper and printers ink go into books the world could well do without.

The first volume goes through the authors grouped according to their fields of work. For all their vast number, he knows them one by one and incisively characterizes their contribution. There are only a few pages for even the very greatest. Important critical problems sometimes cannot be noted, but little pearls of information, interpretation, and comment stud the reader's path. Volume II studies the various literary genres. A lengthy chapter on didactic works passes in review mediaeval reference books, translations from Arabic and Greek, grammars and dictionaries, the *ars dictaminis,* libraries, and classics. He is justly severe toward *dictamen.* He is especially happy in his all-too-brief humanist touches. The middle chapter, on historiography and hagiography, puts life and individuality into chroniclers as well as saints and their biographers. Finally an even 100 pages are given to all forms of verse. The reader is cautioned to distinguish the mere versifiers from the many real poets, for the "mediaeval literary canons did not insist that the quality of poetry be the inseparable companion of versification."

Père de Ghellinck has disarmed criticism by hinting at what he would have wished to do had space permitted. It may be observed that many references to editions in Migne could have ceded valuable space to additional late bibliography and critical remarks concerning it. There are a few bibliographical indications that are not quite up-to-date, obviously because of the war, and there are some unwarranted omissions. Spain is slighted; the *Historia Compostellana,* e.g., is not mentioned. The section on poetry suffers more than the other parts because there could be no quotations. Raby, of course, supplies for us in this case. Probably a little more explana-

tion of technical verse forms would have been welcomed by many readers. Several times the author refers to Honoré d'Autun, though he knows (p. 114) that Augustodunensis would be better. A few typographical errors appear in the notes in connection with English and German titles, e.g., I, 102 and II, 13. The influence of the French has substituted O. for H. as the late Professor Haskins' second initial (p. vii).

There is a remarkably good thirty-one page index, and the paper and printing are excellent. It is devoutly to be hoped that Père de Ghellinck will eventually be permitted to give us a full-length account of at least some phase of mediaeval Latin Literature.

The Catholic University of America

ALOYSIUS K. ZIEGLER

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

The Correspondence of Sir Thomas More. Edited by ELIZABETH FRANCES ROGERS. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1947. Pp. xxii, 584. $7.50.)

St. Thomas More could write witty letters and so could some of his friends, but this collection will not be read from cover to cover by such as like to read the letters of Horace Walpole. There are too many business letters therein, and perfectly impersonal official letters. And some of them are in playful Latin, others in terrible homely French, and others in legal English.

Neither is it a book for those who have never read a life of More, and who think that this correspondence may furnish an authentic biography. Too much that was significant is left out of the letters. Too many letters were lost. The editor's notes do not bring out the drama. They are accurate enough on small details, but they are not decisive. (Imagine referring to More's opponent Frith as a pious man, or to the hypocrite Rich as an able but cruel lawyer.)

Yet this does not take away from the value of the book. To have this collection is a priceless convenience. Here are all the extant letters to and from Thomas More—all except those to and from Erasmus, which are considered as already accessible in Allen's collection of the correspondence of Erasmus. Most of these letters had already been published, but they were scattered. Miss Rogers has done, in putting them under one cover, what ought to be done, and should have been done long ago. It is a superb book of reference. Aside from that, he who holds this volume in his hand cannot but meditate salutarily. Here was a man who played, as the diversity of the letters attest, many parts, and yet who could see clearly how to play his final part as martyr. A lawyer, a very Londonish citizen of London, a humanist, a father of a family (very much the father

of a family), a "bishop's man," a "king's man," how could he keep his head in so many affairs, and yet lose his head so gallantly?

One wonders how the witty satirist came to his glorious end. Certainly at the first he was not aware of what was in store for him. When in his first extant letter—one to John Holt, schoolmaster—he wrote in literary Latin that he was living as he wished—"and might God grant him to wish well," he was not foreseeing what God would have him at last wishing. And during his career as the king's man, it seemed that he was not thinking of anything less mundane than the unlovable foreign intrigues of the king's grace and of Wolsey. And yet by the time that he was writing to John Frith, he was becoming aware of the terrible crisis impending. Nobody has ever described better than he how the contagion of heresy "crèepeth on lyke a kanker. For as the kanker corrupteth the body farther and farther, and turneth the hole partes into some dedely sykenesse, so do these heretykes crepe forth among symple soulys."

To one who knows the life of Thomas More and who turns over these pages, stopping here and there, it seems as if More through all his pilgrimage had been writing letters, some of them trivial, others perforce dull, in order to write the final ones not trivial, not dull, that he wrote to his daughter in the Tower—the only letters which show him as his true self utterly clear and simple. They were written with a coal, and yet they last forever. They have been printed in every biography, but here they come as a climax—the true expression at the journey's end.

"Our Lord blesse you good dowghter and your goode husbande and your little boye and all yours and all my children and all my godchildren and all our friendes."

DANIEL SARGENT

South Natick, Massachusetts

Shakespeare's "Histories": Mirrors of Elizabethan Policy. By LILY B. CAMPBELL. (San Marino, California: Huntington Library. 1947. Pp. xi, 346. $6.75.)

Shakespeare's *Histories,* according to Miss Campbell, form a genre which his contemporaries easily recognized. In the drama "tragedy is concerned with the doings of men which in philosophy are discussed under ethics; history with the doings of men which in philosophy are discussed under politics" (p. 17). This quotation illustrates the author's apparent imperative to categorize creative works. She notes but does not solve the problem that many of Shakespeare's other plays are concerned with politics. Some of her difficulty arises from the fact that she does not adequately realize that politics also form a branch of ethics.

To prove the point that the *Histories* had a specifically historical charac-

ter, Miss Campbell insists that the function of history in Tudor England was to hold the mirror up to present politics. As the present was believed to repeat the past, the historian or historical dramatist by choosing the proper historical incident could describe a pattern for the guidance of the present. The author supports this point with numerous quotations, mainly from the prefaces of Tudor historians.

On the whole, the discussion of the various historical plays is interesting and usually convincing. But the author's thesis makes it necessary for her to identify the Elizabethan circumstances to which the historical plays refer. In doing so she notes that Shakespeare sometimes changed the historical events, as some Tudor historians did, to fit them to contemporary events. This is Freeman's 'past politics' dictum reversed with a vengeance. The incidents of Shakespeare's *Histories*, however, do not always neatly conform to Miss Campbell's thesis.

Fortunately, Tudor historical writing was not so shallow as the author suggests. In part she has been misled by the prefaces to which she has largely restricted herself. The prefaces largely say the same thing. But the histories themselves vary greatly in competence and profundity and give a clearer indication of the meaning which their authors attached to the conventional statements of the preface. William Camden (1551-1623) occasionally used the mirror image but he and many another historian of the time valued history because it taught men prudence, a more subtle value than the somewhat dreary moralizing of Hall, Stow, Holinshed, and *The Mirror for Magistrates*. John Donne was not alone in describing the contents of the first three as "trivial household trash." Indeed, Miss Campbell's early chapters on continental and Tudor historical writing are thin and superficial and compare very unfavorably with her conscientious labors on the *Histories* of Shakespeare.

MATTHEW A. FITZSIMONS

University of Notre Dame

Courts and Cabinets. By G. P. GOOCH. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1946. Pp. xi, 372, xviii. $3.75.)

This aptly entitled volume by a truly great contemporary historian is a series of thirteen critical studies—some of them published previously in the *Contemporary Review*—of one German, four English, and eight French memoirs writers from the days of Richelieu to Gambetta. Though a few of the *mémorialistes* played significant roles in public affairs, all of them were selected because of their records of the events which they witnessed.

In each instance the author elaborates in some detail upon the life and character of the writer, the circumstances under which his or her memoirs were composed, when and in what manner they have been published,

and the opinions that reputable historians have had of their reliability. The most valuable feature of the entire volume, however, is Professor Gooch's own estimates of each of the writers. Judgments on the trustworthiness and merits of the writings of such controversial figures as Bishop Burnet and Horace Walpole by a scholar possessing such a rich acquaintance with their writings, with the events that transpired within their purview, and with the historical literature concerning those events, are deserving of more than passing notice by serious students of modern European history. What is probably the most delightful feature of the book is the tone of the author's own comments. The absence of severe condemnations as well as of unrestrained paeans is evidence of his olympian sense of proportion. Still another merit of the book, and one which may recommend its use in history courses, is the abundant quotations from and summaries of the material contained in the writings of several of the *mémorialistes*, e.g., in those of Fanny Burney and Caulaincourt.

As a single volume rather than as a series of studies, *Courts and Cabinets* is a very creditable piece of historical as distinct from historiographical writing. The six chapters devoted to Madame de Motteville, La Grande Mademoiselle (the Duchesse de Montpensier), and Saint-Simon—each of the thirteen studies consists of two chapters—constitute an excellent treatment of the origins, course, and outcome of the Fronde. However, despite his clear presentation of the contentions of the French *parlementaires*, Professor Gooch does not manifest a very keen appreciation of the merits of those contentions. In the chapters devoted to four well-known English figures—Burnet, Lord Hervey, Horace Walpole, and Fanny Burney—the author is at his best. Owing much to the excellence of the memoirs writers themselves, several eighteenth-century characters stand out in bold relief and the atmosphere of far more than what is strictly called "court life" can be clearly grasped. The study of Frederick the Great's sister, Wilhelmina, is less impressive, unless one takes special delight in learning how thoroughly vile a person Frederick William I was—at least in the eyes of his not too trustworthy daughter. Like the eighteenth-century English studies, those of Madame Campan, Madame de Rémusat, Queen Hortense, and Caulaincourt constitute a rich sequence. Because of their recent publication dates, 1927 and 1933 respectively, the *Memoirs* of Queen Hortense and of Caulaincourt are of special interest. While the story of Hortense's love for Flahaut is more strictly personal and of less historical importance than most of the episodes retold in *Courts and Cabinets*, Caulaincourt impresses the present reviewer as a truly great man—a man of prudence and honor.

The closing study, on Juliette Adam of the Third Republic, provides some interesting side-lights on the politics of the Bismarckian era, and also a reminder that the absence of virtue and wisdom may be as con-

spicuous in republican as in monarchical governments. Were Fanny Burney writing today rather than in 1788, she might well say of some recent administrations as she did of the court of George III: ". . . if I had the direction of any young person's destination, I would never risk them into such a mode of living. For though vices might be as well avoided there as anywhere, . . . there were mischiefs of a smaller kind, extremely pernicious to all nobleness of character, to which this Court, with all its really bright examples, was as liable as any other—mischiefs of jealousy, narrowness and selfishness." Professor Gooch's latest volume might well be sub-titled, as he suggests in his preface, "Studies in Human Nature."

PAUL LEVACK

Fordham University

Frederick the Great, the Ruler, the Writer, the Man. By G. P. GOOCH. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1947. Pp. ix, 376, iv. $5.00.)

Dr. Gooch has most of the craftsman's virtues of the trained historian—accuracy, patience, thorough knowledge of sources, ability to condense and to paraphrase, respect for the evidence, judicial calm and balance. He writes easily and clearly, without bad habits and without distinction. If he is just a bit dull, if he is usually so sensible that he seems wholly unoriginal, perhaps he is all the more true to the great traditions of his craft.

This book is not strictly a biography of Frederick, nor even a "Life and Times." Its subtitle is helpful: "Ruler, Writer, Man." Dr. Gooch in his first three chapters runs rapidly over Frederick's political career, summarizing, as all must who tackle this subject, from Koser but judging and assessing, not like a Prussian, but like an English nineteenth-century liberal educated in part in Germany. Dr. Gooch does not approve Frederick's political immorality; but he does not find the German, nor even the Prussian, nation politically immoral. These chapters, barely 100 pages in all, make an excellent condensed political and military history of the reign.

In the next eight chapters Dr. Gooch writes of Frederick as a man, of his education, his character, his relations with other human beings. Here again, this book provides an admirable summary of the immense body of writing on Frederick's personality, and a modest and moderate balancing of conflicting points of view. Dr. Gooch devotes three chapters, based chiefly on paraphrases and quotations from the correspondence of the king and the philosopher, to the relationship with Voltaire. They form an interesting contrast, if only in technique, with Lytton Strachey's treatment of the same subject in his *Books and Characters.* One of the best chapters deals with the relations between Frederick and the only one of his brothers who counted, Prince Henry. In general, these eight chapters are the newest and the freshest part of the book, and the most useful to

the average reader. They represent an admirable culling from a vast and somewhat confused literature.

The next three chapters analyze Frederick as a writer and thinker. This side of Frederick is still not very well known; and, indeed, it seems likely that the *Anti-Machiavel* and the histories might have been forgotten, like Frederick's bad French verse, had their author not been a great king. Dr. Gooch at any rate gives faithful analyses, and the reader may make his own judgment. Dr. Gooch is not primarily a critic, nor even a historian of ideas, and these chapters need to be focused more sharply than he has focused them on some specific critical standards. The kind of calm nineteenth-century liberalism the author holds is today hardly such a focus.

A final chapter, really a kind of appendix, is entitled "Through German Eyes," and is again a very competent summing up of German opinion of Frederick, mostly as reflected in the work of historians, from the eighteenth century to the present. A parallel chapter "Through Alien Eyes" would have been equally interesting, had Dr. Gooch seen fit to write it.

The structure of the book has apparently made a certain amount of repetition unavoidable. Thus Voltaire appears briefly in several chapters before the three which are assigned to him. Dr. Gooch, of course, does not claim in this book to have done research in the ordinary sense of the word. Nevertheless, this is a useful work, and one that can be highly recommended as a sort of general introduction to the German problem of today. It assumes no great knowledge of background, and though clearly not designed as a textbook, has many of the virtues of that kind of writing. In the hands of a skillful teacher who has a firm grip on the realities of human nature, it should prove a very convenient book.

CRANE BRINTON

Harvard University

NOTES AND COMMENTS

The REVIEW welcomes the new Archbishop of Washington and Chancellor of the Catholic University of America, the Most Reverend Patrick A. O'Boyle. His appointment to the See of Washington begins a new page in the history of the Church in America.

John Corish Devereux (1774-1848) and Nicholas Devereux (1791-1855), natives of Wexford, Ireland, and members of a prominent family, migrated to America in their youth, settled in Utica, New York, and carved out for themselves notable careers as prosperous business men and generous, apostolic Catholics. Of the two, Nicholas is probably the more widely known because of the wider diffusion of his charities. Thus it was he who, as one of the joint owners of the 400,000 acre Holland Land Purchase in western New York State, donated the land for St. Bonaventure's College, near Allegany, Cattaraugus County; and it was he who personally persuaded its founders, Italian Franciscans, to make the foundation. He was one of the early benefactors of the North American College in Rome, when that institution was in the process of establishment. And his aid to Connecticut Catholics in the years of Know-Nothing bigotry was neither small nor soon forgotten. The Devereux family, to the present day, has inherited the influence and the faith of these two men. However, neither John nor Nicholas has, as yet, been made the subject of the full biography which both deserve; or at least Nicholas deserves.

The Collection of Regional History, housed in Boardman Hall, Cornell University, has recently acquired some Devereux papers which those interested in the history of this family will wish to inspect. In its *Second Report of the Curator, 1945-1946,* p. 14, the Collection announces these papers, the gift of Mr. L. W. Devereux of Utica, New York, as follows: "DEVEREUX COLLECTION, 1800-1942. 309 pieces. Correspondence, typescript, (1800-1839) of Devereux and Butler families, William M. Norris and James Clapp on the suffering of Catholics in Ireland, DeWitt Clinton, the trial of General Hull, Aaron Burr, and other subjects. Correspondence, business and personal (1842-1854) of Mary, Nicholas and John Devereux and Edward Wetmore. Stocks of early Utica companies, receipts, surveys and clippings. Utica, Oneida County (428). Restricted."

The American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia has recently been made the depository for a group of almost 100 letters written to Marc Anthony Frenaye (1783-1873), important Catholic layman, who was the friend and confidant of a number of American bishops. These letters were discovered last summer in the attic of St. John's Rectory on 13th Street in Philadelphia and were given to the society's collection housed at St. Charles Seminary, Overbrook. They deal with such items as the building of the seminary at Overbrook, donations made by American bishops

to the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, and the early days of Francis X. Gartland, first Bishop of Savannah, in that southern city.

In addition to this newly-discovered correspondence to Frenaye the Society had already about 300 other letters to Frenaye which have now been properly arranged and catalogued for the use of research workers. The Frenaye collection is an important one for nineteenth-century American Catholicism, particularly in economic matters, as he gave counsel to so many bishops of the American Church on their business affairs.

In the Archives of the University of Notre Dame there is a manuscript history of the activities of the priests and sisters in the Civil War. The manuscript was apparently submitted to the Ave Maria Press for publication by its compiler, David Powers Conyngham. Many of the chaplains were yet living when the manuscript was prepared and some of the accounts of chaplains were written by others besides the compiler, perhaps in some cases by the chaplains themselves. The manuscript contains several chapters on the Catholic chaplains in the Confederate Army. More important than these accounts of the priests and sisters, perhaps, is a series of testimonial letters which Conyngham included in the introduction. These letters were contributed by the more prominent Union and Confederate commanders in recognition of the services of the priests and sisters. Unfortunately, no trace of the originals of his correspondence has been found, although the compiler was editor of a New York Catholic paper at the time of his death in 1883.

There are few experiences which are more gratifying and thrilling to a research worker in history than the finding of new material. In the January, 1947, issue of the REVIEW (p. 464) we reported a case of this kind in the discovery of the correspondence of Monsignor Denis J. O'Connell during his rectorship of the American College, Rome (1885-1895). It had lain in two old trunks on the top floor of the chancery building in Richmond for over a quarter of a century. This priceless find for American Catholic history is now almost completely indexed. The work was done, at the suggestion of Bishop Ireton, under the capable direction of Thomas T. McAvoy, C.S.C., at the University of Notre Dame.

In this connection it is interesting to note that the index cards of the Lincoln Papers at the Library of Congress, opened to research students with much fanfare last July, contain fourteen letters of Archbishop Hughes of New York to President Lincoln and Secretary of State Seward, as well as four letters of Archbishop Kenrick of Baltimore to the President. On December 7, 1947, the New York *Times* carried the story of the opening of a steel chest locked in the vaults of the Reading Company since 1876 and containing from 300 to 400 documents relating to the Molly Maguires. This secret labor organization operating in the anthracite coal regions of

Pennsylvania was the subject of much controversy in the 1870's. Among the letters is one of Bishop James F. Wood of Philadelphia dated January 19, 1864, urging Catholics to shun membership in secret societies, and particularly warning them against the Molly Maguires and the Buckshots. A study on this subject was done some years ago at the Catholic University of America by J. Walter Coleman entitled *Labor Disturbances in Pennsylvania, 1850-1880* (Washington, 1936).

Another rich find resulting from digging in closets and attics for manuscript materials of our history was revealed with the recent publication of *The Journals of Francis Parkman,* edited by Mason Wade (New York, 1947), in two volumes. This work tells the story of their discovery. Wade's biography of Parkman written in 1942 had to be done without benefit of these journals. Wade exhausted all the more obvious places where these journals might be and finally went to Parkman's old home on Chestnut Street in Boston, closed since his death in 1893. There in the drawers of the historian's desk were found the long-lost journals. All students will agree with Allan Nevin's judgment that "This is a discovery of first-rate importance to everyone interested in American history or letters." (*New York Times Book Review,* November 23, 1947, p. 1).

There is a very important lesson in all this for Catholic historians of the American Church. No possible clew should be overlooked in attics, storerooms, and closets for the deposits of documents pertaining to the history of dioceses, religious orders, and institutions. The managing editor of the REVIEW remembers his own elation when in the summer of 1946 a thorough search of a large chest in the attic in the cathedral residence in Baltimore turned up the diary of Cardinal Gibbons which had been missing for over twenty years.

In the history of the native Catholic population of the United States during the nineteenth century there is a dearth of materials about the middle class families which constituted the mainstay of Catholic growth. Unless these families produced clergymen or some prominent person in the political sphere, we have little record of their accomplishments. Recent unpublished genealogical studies which have traced some western families across the country from the first entry should be amplified to include the occupations, businesses, and literary accomplishments of these people. Likewise a similar contribution to the history of American Catholicism could be made if Catholic colleges would put forth an effort to trace the later lives of their alumni and to estimate their contribution to the general welfare.

There are so many cross currents in American Catholic history for the historian that he may have to wait many years before all can be seen in the full perspective. There have been nativistic and foreign-born problems, nationalistic differences, and even local and regional differences which have

contributed to the growth and retardation of Catholic organization in the United States. One of the chief sources upon which to construct a more objective evaluation of these differences during the nineteenth century will ever be the Archives of the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda. But a source less troubled by official attitude is the correspondence of the Americans in Europe. Some of these Americans, such as the students at the Louvain and Roman American colleges, were perhaps a bit immature in their judgments. But the letters of the rectors, such as Fathers Silas M. Chatard and William McCloskey in Rome, afford many interesting contemporary appreciations of American affairs. McCloskey, for instance, once wrote that some Romans thought Archbishop Hughes' interference in the war on the part of the North would hinder the Church in its future relations with the Confederate States.

Few historians know that an effort was made several generations ago to establish an episcopal see at Washington, D. C. Recently discovered letters of Archbishop Francis Patrick Kenrick to Bishop John McGill of Richmond indicate that in 1857 Bishop McGill sought to have his episcopal see changed from Richmond to Washington. The Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda refused permission. Bishop McGill at that time regarded the region around Alexandria as the most promising part of the Diocese of Richmond. However, Washington was not actually within his diocese.

The Library of Holy Cross College, Worcester, Massachusetts, has been the recent recipient of a number of rare volumes of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Volume XXXVI of the *Historical Records and Studies* of the United States Catholic Historical Society contains the Meehan lectures of John J. Meng delivered before the society in March, 1947, two articles by John K. Sharp on aspects of Catholicism in the Diocese of Brooklyn, and an initial essay on "Our American Cardinals" by Thomas J. McMahon, editor of the society's publications.

The latest addition of the Annals of the Polish Roman Catholic Union Archives and Museum is a brochure on *Casimir Pulaski* by Wladyslaw Konopczynski, translated from the Polish by Irena Makarewicz. This sixty-two-page pamphlet on the great polish hero has been done in the main from manuscripts in the collection of the Union at its Chicago headquarters.

It was announced this fall that the microfilm laboratory of the University of Chicago, founded in 1936, has photographed more than a million and a half pages during the past year. In particular it has put three complete Chicago newspapers on microfilm. A current project is the reproduction on film of manuscripts on middle American cultural anthropology. 9000

pages of this original material have been made available at about half a cent a page. Each year the briefs and records of the United States Supreme Court have been filmed, thus reducing 50,000 pages that occupy twenty or thirty linear feet of shelf space to one cubic foot of film. The laboratory is the largest of its kind in the world.

As a result of questionnaires sent to 150 colleges and universities Professor Edgar Eugene Robinson of Stanford University has published a valuable brochure, *Scholarship and Cataclysm: Teaching and Research in American History, 1939-1945* (Stanford University Press, 1947). It has much factual information on trends in research, interest in American history, and development of courses and programs.

Mundelein College, Chicago, has published in a seventy-page booklet its symposium on the United Nations, October 21-25, 1946.

The first of the German Foreign Office documents that were seized by the American and British forces are now being edited by American, British, and French historians in Berlin. It is expected that they will be published in the course of the year. The project of editing has been put in the hands of professional historians. Raymond Sontag, professor of history in the University of California, has been called to Washington as American editor-in-chief, and Malcolm Carroll, professor of history in Duke University, is in charge of operations in Berlin as assistant editor. The purpose of this publication is to give an open account of German diplomacy relating to World War II. Besides carrying conviction as a documentary record, this material should be fundamentally helpful in re-educating the German people and in enlightening world opinion.

Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee, has recently established an Institute for Brazilian Studies under the direction of Professor T. Lynn Smith, formerly of the Louisiana State University. Brazilian history will be in charge of Alexander Marchant, who has just returned from Brazil, where he served as publications officer of the American Embassy.

The Commission on History of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History met in Mexico City in October under the chairmanship of Silvio Zavala. The following Americans took part in the meetings: Arthur P. Whitaker, University of Pennsylvania; Lewis Hanke, Library of Congress; James F. King, University of California; Robert Randolph, Bureau of the Budget; André Simonpietri, Department of State; Frank Tannenbaum, Columbia University; Isabel Kelly, Smithsonian Institution; and Albert William Bork, University of Arizona.

Mr. Charles R. Boxer, Camões professor of Portuguese at King's College, London, will spend the months of July and August, 1948 in the Library of Congress as its consultant in Portuguese studies. Professor

Boxer is perhaps the outstanding authority on the Portuguese in the Far East, particularly in the seventeenth century, and his library of Portuguese Orientalia is one of the great collections of its kind.

Augustin Fliche has precious advice for mediaeval church historians in a brief article "Orientations et méthodes de l'histoire ecclésiastique mediévale," which appears in the *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research,* May and November, 1946.

Bulletin No. 19 of S. Harrison Thompson's *Progress of Medieval and Renaissance Studies in the United States and Canada* (University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado. Pp. 187. Price $1.50) appeared this fall after an interval of three years. Gray C. Boyce devotes more than thirty pages to a discussion of "American Studies in Medieval Education." There is a new ranking of libraries as regards their monograph holdings, as well as a supplementary list of 100 monographs. An especially useful feature is a thirty-page list of "Continental Publications on the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, 1940-1946." The editor points out that it is neither critical nor complete. The usual lists appear: Papers Read at Meetings, Projects, Photostatica and Desiderata Photostatica, Books in Press, Lists of Active Scholars and of Dissertations. It will be a great help to scholarship if the bulletin can get back to annual publication. The project merits wide support.

The tenth annual issue (1947) of *Bibliografia missionaria* covers the years 1943-1946. It is compiled by Giovanni Rommerskirchen, O.M.I., with the aid of Giovanni Dindinger, O.M.I. (Unione Missionaria del Clero in Italia, Via di Propaganda, Roma.)

The latest issue of the *Harvard Divinity School Bulletin* (June 30, 1947) contains three lectures delivered by John Haynes Holmes, Wallace Brett Donham, and George La Piana, as well as the usual extensive list of book reviews and bibliography of recent publications in church history and related fields.

The *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research: Theses Supplement Number 9, June 1947,* lists the theses completed for university degrees in the United Kingdom, 1940-45. The following doctoral dissertations, copies of which are in the respective university libraries, seem to have special interest for our readers: Prince D. Obolensky, "History of Bogomilism in Bulgaria" (Cambridge); F. H. Hunt, "The Philosophy of Law of St. Thomas Aquinas" (Cambridge); R. A. L. Smith, "Canterbury Cathedral Priory" (Cambridge); A. A. T. Ehrhardt, "City-state and Church" (Cambridge); I. T. Gillan, "The Christian Inscriptions of North Africa: a Study in the Popular Religion of the Early (Western) Church" (Edinburgh); J. Sedlo, "The Influence of John Hus on Europe to the Time of the Reformation, with Special Reference to Central and Eastern Europe"

(Edinburgh); G. W. Bromily, "Herder's Contribution to the Romantic Philosophy of History, with Special Reference to the Theological Implications" (Edinburgh); Margaret U. Apps, "The Social Structure of the English Shires on the Welsh Border between the Norman Conquest and the Fourteenth Century" (Leeds); Renée Marcousé, "The Decoration of Norman Baptismal Fonts in Relation to English Twelfth-century Sculpture" (London); J. L. Flajszer, "The Doctrine of Poverty in its Religious, Social and Political Aspects as Illustrated by Some Twelfth and Thirteenth Century Movements" (London); A. K. Babette Roberts, "The Administration of the Estates of St. George's Chapel, Windsor, in the Fourteenth Century" (London); M. S. Lew, "The Works of Rabbi Moses Isserls as a Source of the History of Jews in Poland in the Sixteenth Century" (London); I. Fishman, "The History of Jewish Education in Central Europe from the Beginning of the Seventeenth Century to 1782 (the edict of toleration issued by Joseph II of Austria.)" (London); Kathleen Edwards, "The Clergy of the English Secular Cathedrals in the Fourteenth Century, with Special Reference to the Clergy of Salisbury" (Manchester); E. H. L. Sexton, "A Descriptive and Bibliographical List of Irish Figure Sculptures of the Early Christian Period, with a Critical Assessment of Their Significance" (Oxford); J. M. B. Fradin, "Ralph Neville, Bishop of Chichester and Chancellor" (Oxford); U. R. Q. Henriques, "Grievances of the English Clergy in the Late Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries, with Special Reference to the *gravamina* of 1309" (Oxford); W. H. C. Frend, "The Influence of Social and Economic Conditions on Regional Movements in the Early Church up to A.D. 500, with Special Reference to the Donatist Schism" (Oxford); W. O. Hassall, "A Study of the Nunnery of St. Mary, Clerkenwell, and Its Property, with an Edition of Its Cartulary" (Oxford); M. M. Morgan "The English Priories and Manors of the Abbey of Bec-Hellouin" (Oxford); R. H. Hilton, "Aspects of the Economic Development of Some Leicestershire Monastic Estates in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries: Based on the Record of Leicester and Owston Abbeys" (Oxford); J. S. Roskell, "The Personnel of the House of Commons in 1422" (Oxford); J. W. Williams, "The Relations of James I and VI and the Court of Savoy" (St. Andrews); A. Cohen, "The Jewish Economic Religious and Social Life in Mediaeval Europe as Illustrated by the 'Responsa' of Rabbi Meir ben Baruch of Rothenburg (1215-93)" (Wales).

Volume XXXVIII, Nos. 1-2-3, of *A Ordem* is devoted to articles on St. Benedict and monasticism.

Dom Jean Leclercq has unearthed in Switzerland a twelfth-century manuscript containing 152 sermons for the liturgical year. Many are variant forms, longer or shorter, of known sermons of St. Bernard, and they may show us St. Bernard in the process of developing his

homilies from a simpler oral style to the finished literary form ("Inédits bernardins dans un manuscrit d'Engelberg," *Revue Mabillon*, 37, Janvier-Mai, 1947, 1-16).

For the benefit of English readers John Morson, O.C.R., calls attention in *Pax* (Autumn, 1947, pp. 131-135) to the discovery during the war of the primitive text of St. Stephen Harding's *Carta caritatis*. Scholars were aware of the fact that the published text differed from the first rescension of the *Carta*. The lost text was discovered in Yugoslavia, Codex 31 in the library of the University of Laibach. The manuscript dates from the second half of the twelfth century. Codex Car. C. 175, dated 1273, in the Central Library of Zürich is a copy. Monsignor Joseph Turk published the text of Laibach with a critical study of it in Slavonic (*Prvotna Charta Caritatis*, Laibach, 1942). The *Analecta Sacri Ordinis Cisterciensis*, Rome, 1945, has reproduced this in Latin. Robert Pourtoit, O.C.R., published the text of the Zürich ms. in the *Collectanea Ordinis Cisterciensium Reformatorum*, April, 1946. As regards differences in the texts, the primitive recension gives more power to the abbot of Citeaux and requires no visitation of that abbey. The revised *Carta*, which seems to have been adopted between 1134 and 1152, puts more power into the hands of the general chapter and provides for a visitation of Citeaux. There is a difference too in the manner of electing abbots, in administering a monastery *sede vacante*, and of deposing an abbot.

Profesor Carleton J. H. Hayes was elected President of the New York State Historical Association on September 4, 1947.

The Reverend Syvester D. Luby has been appointed president of Loras College. Father Luby did his work for the M. A. in history at the Catholic University of America under the direction of the late Monsignor Peter Guilday. He is completing his dissertation for the Ph.D in history at the University of Wisconsin.

The following promotions in the department of history at the Catholic University of America have been announced: John Tracy Ellis has been made a professor; Manoel S. Cardozo, an associate professor; Carleton M. Sage, S.S., and Sister Marie Carolyn Klinkhamer, O.P., assistant professors.

John J. Hooker of Ashford, Kent, England, has joined the staff of the University of Notre Dame as instructor in European history. Mr. Hooker served in the Royal Air Force during the war.

Lázaro Lamadrid, O.F.M., of the Academy of American Franciscan History, Washington, D. C., has left for Guatemala on business of the Academy.

The centennial of the Diocese of Buffalo was observed on September

22-25 by a Eucharistic Congress which was attended by seven cardinals, nearly seventy archbishops and bishops, and hundreds of priests and laity. The members of the College of Cardinals present represented six countries, viz., the United States, Canada, England, Australia, Peru, and Brazil.

The Yakima Valley Catholic centennial was celebrated October 5-7 at Yakima and Ahtanum mission, about fifteen miles west of the city of Yakima. A pageant, written by Father Leo F. Lamphier, S.J., was presented to portray the Catholic history of the valley. Father W. L. Davis, S.J., preached the centennial sermon. In it he emphasized the beginnings under the Oblates of Mary Immaculate, 1847-1855, five of whom came to America from Marseilles in 1847 and made their way west over the Oregon Trail. Father Louis N. St. Ouge and Jean B. Boulet, later ordained a priest, labored at Ahtanum from 1867 to 1871. In the latter year the Jesuits took over. The celebration was arranged by Father Henry B. Conrad, O.M.I. A beautiful commemorative book was brought out for the occasion. The Federal Government cached letters on October 6 at Yakima Post Office in honor of the event.

On November 30, 1847, Modest Demers was consecrated Bishop of Vancouver Island by Archbishop Norbert Blanchet. The latter had just returned from Rome, where he had secured the erection of the Province of Oregon City, the second province in the United States. He brought with him seven Notre Dame nuns from Namur, four diocesan priests, two subdeacons and a seminarian, two priests and four brothers of Notre Dame of the Holy Cross, and two priests and three brothers of the Society of Jesus.

Francis X. Murphy, C.SS.R., assistant archivist of the eastern province of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer, is the author of *The Centennial History of Saint Alphonsus Parish,* which commemorates in an attractive illustrated brochure of fifty-five pages the story of the development of this parish which was began in the summer of 1847 on Thompson Street in New York City.

Volume XIII, Nos. I-II (1947) of *Orientalia christiana periodica* is devoted to the first volume of *Miscellanea Guillaume de Jerphanion* presented to him by scholars in commemoration of his seventieth birthday. The distinguished Jesuit scholar has been pouring out articles and books on the archaeology and history of the Near East for forty years. Four Americans contribute articles to the rich *mélange:* Peter Charanis, Martin J. Higgins, Alexander A. Vasiliev, and Thomas Whittemore.

Père Joseph de Ghellinck, S.J., writes an eleven-page evaluation of "Les six volumes des *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*" in the *Nouvelle revue théologique* (November, 1947).

Professor Martin Grabmann writes appreciations of H. Denifle and

Cardinal Ehrle on the occasion of the hundredth anniversary of their birth in Band 56 (1946) of the *Philosophisches Jahrbuch.* Monsignor Grabmann has a similar article: "Maurice de Wulf: Das Institut Supérieur de Philosophie an der Universität Löwen und die Erforschung der mittelalterlichen Scholastik," in honor of the distinguished professor on his eightieth birthday.

In *Ephemerides liturgicae* (Vol. LX, Fasc. III-IV) F. Combaluzier writes an obituary notice on Victor-Martial Leroquais who died on March 1, 1946. Canon Leroquais published magnificent catalogues and editions of mediaeval liturgical books. His bibliography is appended to the brief appreciation.

With the sudden death on December 3, of Cornelius J. Kirkfleet, O. Praem., the Association lost one of its most faithful members. Father Kirkfleet, who for years was pastor of St. John the Baptist Church at Somonauk, Illinois, was transferred only last summer to become pastor of St. Willibrord's Church in Green Bay. He was sixty-six years of age at the time of his death and during the many years of parochial life which he spent in the priesthood he found time for a great deal of historical writing. Among his published works were a *History of St. Norbert* (St. Louis, 1916), *The Life of Patrick Augustine Feehan, Bishop of Nashville and First Archbishop of Chicago* (Chicago, 1922), and *The History of the Parishes of the Diocese of Rockford* (Chicago, 1924). His final volume was *The White Canons of St. Norbert. A History of the Premonstratensian Order in the British Isles and America* (West De Pere, 1943). It was the sound quality of his research on Premonstratensian history in particular that prompted the Committee on Nominations for 1947 to suggest Father Kirkfleet's name to the Association's membership for the office of Second Vice-President for 1948. It was while the ballots were still being received at the executive office that the sad news of his death reached us.

Documents: Select Documents—XLII. Some papal Privileges for Gilbertine Houses. C. R. Cheney (*Bulletin of the Institute of Histor. Research,* Vol. XXI, No. 62)—A Peruvian *Donativo Gracioso* in 1717. Robert S. Smith (*Hispanic Amer. Histor. Rev.,* Aug.)—British Schemes against Spanish America in 1806. Charles F. Mullett (*Hispanic Amer. Histor. Rev.,* May)—History of St. Nazianz. Tr. by J. J. Schlicher (*Wisconsin Mag. of Hist.,* Sept.)—Henry Adams Reports on a German Gymnasium. Harold Dean Cater (*Amer. Histor. Rev.,* Oct.).

The editors of the REVIEW wish to remind prospective authors of articles that in preparing manuscripts for print they should follow *A Manual of Style,* tenth edition (University of Chicago Press, 1947) and *Webster's New International Dictionary,* second edition, (1930).

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

MISCELLANEOUS

Reflections on the Function of the History of Philosophy in a Liberal Education. James I. Conway (*New Scholasticism*, Oct.).

Orientations et méthodes de l'histoire ecclésiastique médiévale. Augustin Fliche (*Bulletin of the Institute of Histor. Research*, Vol. XXI, No. 62).

The Apostolate through History. Liam Brophy (*Social Justice Rev.*, Dec.).

El orden internacional y la ley natural. Kurt F. Reinhardt (*Universidad pontificia bolivariana*, Vol. XIII, No. 48-49).

Originalità del concetto di storia di A Rosmini. A. M. Bianchi (*Divus Thomas* [Piacenza], July and Sept.).

Vitoria y la concepción democrática del poder público y del estado. Teófilo Urdánoz (*La Ciencia Tomista*, Oct.).

Churches and Civilizations. Arnold Toynbee (*Yale Rev.*, Vol. XXXVII, No. 1).

The Vatican and Peace, 1947. Camille M. Cianfarra (*Sign*, Aug.).

Pius XII on Nationalization. Lewis Watt (*Month*, Sept.).

National Sovereignty and Individual Behavior. Gerhart Niemeyer (*Jrn. of Politics*, Aug.).

Democracy and the Rule of Law. Charles N. R. McCoy (*Mod. Schoolman*, Nov.).

Divvs-Imperator (Problemas de cronología y transmisión de las obras de los jurisconsultos romanos). Alvaro d'Ors Pérez-Peix (*Anuario de historia del derecho español*, Vol. XIV).

La evolución de la idea de "imperium" en la edad media. Juan Beneyto Pérez (*ibid.*).

Aspects of Mediaeval Thought on Church and State. Gerhart B. Ladner (*Rev. of Politics*, Oct.).

The Corporate Idea and the Body Politic in the Middle Ages. Anton-Hermann Chroust (*ibid.*).

The Significance of Mediaeval Intellectual Culture. Alois Dempf (*ibid.*).

Puritan of Carthage [Tertullian]. Morton S. Enslin (*Jrn. of Religion*, July).

Attitude of the Ante-Nicene Fathers toward Greek Artistic Achievement. Frederick A. Norwood (*Jrn. of the Hist. of Ideas*, Oct.).

Les exégèses d'Alexandrie et d'Antioche. Conflit ou malentendu? Jacques Guillet (*Recherches de science religieuse*, July).

Notes sur le catalogue des oeuvres d'Hippolyte. Pierre Nautin (*ibid.*).

Origène et Maxime de Tyr. Jean Daniélou (*ibid.*).

Theophilus of Antioch to Autolycus. Robert M. Grant (*Harvard Theolog. Rev.*, Oct.).

The Cultural Mission of Russian Orthodoxy. Robert P. Casey (*ibid.*).

La satire dans les *Lettres* de saint Jérôme. Ch. Favez (*Revue des études latines*, tome XXIV).

Commodien et les invasions du V^e^ siècle .P. Courcelle (*ibid.*).

Saint Augustin et l'évolutionisme. S. Joseph-Arthur (*La Revue de l'Université Laval*, Oct.).

The Prayer to Jesus. E. Behr-Sigel (*Eastern Churches Quart.*, July).

The Divine Office in the Byzantine Rite—I. D. C. McPherson (*ibid.*).

The History of Catharism. Scholasticus (*Church Quart. Rev.*, July).

Christian Citizenship. Some Reflections on St. Augustine, Ep. 138. Leonard Hodgson (*ibid.*, Oct.).

Wit and Mystery: a Revaluation in Mediaeval Latin Hymnody. Walter J. Ong (*Speculum*, July).

Irish Saints in Early German Literature. John Hennig (*ibid.*).

The Scriptorium at Corbie: II. The Script and the Problems. Leslie Webber Jones (*ibid.*).

Lex Salica, H. Simon Stein (*ibid.*).

Observations on a Late Mediaeval Painting Medium. James Watrous (*ibid.*).

The Meaning of *Placitum* and *Mallum* in the Capitularies. Francis N. Estey (*ibid.*).
A Note on the Date of the Great Advent Antiphons. J. Allen Cabaniss (*ibid.*).
The Beginnings of the Legend of Boethius. Howard R. Patch (*ibid.*).
The Mediaeval Academy: Evaluation and Revaluation. George R. Coffman (*ibid.*).
The *Pèlerinage de Charlemagne* in New Light on Saint-Denis. Alfred Adler (*ibid.*, Oct.).
Seigneurial Administration in Twelfth Century Montpellier. Archibald Ross Lewis (*ibid.*).
The Old Man of the Mountain. Charles E. Nowell (*ibid.*).
From Segontium to Sinadon—the Legends of a *Cité Gaste*. Roger Sherman Loomis (*ibid.*).
On Writing and Printing Gothic, II. Francis P. Magoun, Jr. (*ibid.*).
A Note on Ibn Quzmān. A. R. Nykl (*ibid.*).
The "Miracle" Narrative and Play. Dunstan Stout (*Homiletic and Pastoral Rev.*, Nov. and Dec.).
The Black Death. R. G. Cookson (*Month*, Oct.).
The Newly Found Chart of Charity. John Morson (*Pax*, Autumn, 1947).
The Place of Holy Scripture in the Theology of St. Thomas. J. Van der Ploeg (*Thomist*, Oct.).
Notice et extraits d'un manuscrit franciscain. Ferdinand M. Delorme (*Collectanea Franciscana*, Tome XV, Fasc. I-IV).
Il processo dei miracoli del P. Matteo da Bascio (ottobre 1552). Davide M. da Portogruaro (*ibid.*).
Joannes Maria Zamoro ab Udine, O.F.M. Cap., praeclarus mariologus (1579-1649). Archangelus a Roč (*ibid.*).
Neuaufgefundene Handschriften mit Werken aus dem Bereich des Anselm von Laon. Arthur Landgraf (*ibid.*).
St. Bonaventure's Theory of the Rationes Seminales. Sylvan Conover (*Round Table of Franciscan Research*, June).
The "Theologism" of Duns Scotus. Allan B. Wolter (*Franciscan Studies*, Sept.).
The History of the Problem of the Authenticity of the Summa of Alexander of Hales. Victorin Doucet (*ibid.*).
Poverty in Perfection according to St. Bonaventure. Aidan Carr (*ibid.*).
Christ Jesus the Secure Foundation according to St. Cyril of Alexandria. Dominic J. Unger (*ibid.*).
Fra Antonio da Brescia, O.Min.; Fra Giocondo da Verona, Architect of St. Peter's in Rome; Inventions made by Friar Roger Bacon. John M. Lenhart (*ibid.*).
List of Ministers General and Vicars General of the Order of Friars Minor. (*Provincial Chronicle*, Vol. XX, No. 1).
Early [Capuchin] Missionary Activity after 1551. Christian Schembri (*Round Table of Franciscan Research*, Dec.).
European Beginnings of the Holy Name Society. Sister M. Lilliana Owens (*Records of the Amer. Catholic Histor. Soc.*, Sept.).
Une "Societas Iesu" au XV[e] siècle. A. DeBil (*Nouvelle revue théologique*, Nov.).
Luther and Non-Catholic Christology. H. Francis Davis (*Clergy Rev.*, Sept.).
The Lenox Gutenberg Bible, 1847-1947. (*Bull. of New York Public Library*, Oct.).
Katholische Mission auf Föroyar. E. Krenn (*Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft* [Nouvelle revue de science missionnaire], Vol. III, Fasc. 4).
Spuren christlicher Glaubenswahrheiten im Koran (V). Polemik gegen die Hauptdogmen des Christentums. P. J. Henninger (*ibid.*).

EUROPEAN

The Present State of Czechoslovak Archives. J. V. Polišensky (*Bulletin of the Institute of Histor. Research*, Vol. XXI, No. 62).

Historical Activities in Belgium during the Year 1946. Jean Stengers (*ibid.*).
Establishment of Archbishops in Europe. I. P. Shaw (*Church Quart. Rev.*, Oct.).
Alfred Mordecai's Observations of European Life One Hundred Years Ago. James A. Padgett (*North Carolina Histor. Rev.*, July).
Belgium's International Position. A. Thomas (*Month*, Sept.).
Prêtres belges tués par les gueux, 1566-1582. E. de Moreau (*Nouvelle revue théologique*, Sept.).
Un archevêque d'avant-garde au XVII^e siècle: Fénelon. J. Berteloot (*ibid.*).
A propos du Cardinal Baudrillart. Henri G. DeChampris (*La Revue de l'Université Laval*, Sept.).
Potamio de Lisboa. José Madoz (*Revista española de teología*, Vol. VII, No. 1).
Un nuevo penitencial español. Justo Pérez de Urbel y Luis Vázquez de Parga (*Anuario de historia del derecho español*, Vol. XIV).
El proceso en los reinos cristianos de nuestra reconquista antes de la recepción romano-canónica. José López Ortiz (*ibid.*).
Las relaciones entre el derecho canónico y el derecho secular en los concilios españoles del siglo XI. José Maldonado y Fernández del Torco (*ibid.*).
La territorialidad de la legislación visigoda. Alfonso Garcia Gallo (*ibid.*).
Bulario de la inquisición española. Bernardino Llorca (*Estudios eclesiásticos*, July).
Francisco Suárez: una metafísica que ilumina El Escorial. Joaquín Iriarte (*Razón y fe*, Sept.).
Los tratados de reforma del P. Mtro. Avila. Luis Sala Balust (*La Ciencia Tomista*, Oct.).
El "Gobierno de la Insula Barataria", Speculum principis cervantino. Peter Frank de Andrea (*Filosofía y letras*, Apr.).
The Propaganda War on Spain. Richard Pattee (*Columbia*, Oct., Nov., Dec.).
Matthias of Salo. His Life. Virgil Mullen (*Round Table of Franciscan Research*, June).
Matthias of Salo. His Works. Demetrius Manousos (*ibid.*).
The Founder of the Swiss [Capuchin] Province. Blase Gitzen (*Round Table of Franciscan Research*, Dec.).
The Peasant Revolt of Engelbrekt Engelbrektsson and the Birth of Modern Sweden. John J. Murray (*Jrn. of Mod. Hist.*, Sept.).
Woodrow Wilson and the Independence of Small Nations in Central Europe. Guido Kisch (*ibid.*).
Jean Bodin and the Estates—General of 1576. Owen Ulph (*ibid.*, Dec.).
Austria Today. Erik v. Kuehnelt-Leddih (*America*, Dec. 13).
Les catholiques de Tchécoslovaquie et nous. A. Taymans (*Nouvelle revue théologique*, Nov.).
German Historiography during the Second World War: A Bibliographical Survey. Felix Gilbert (*Amer. Histor. Rev.*, Oct.).
Western and Eastern Traditions of Central Europe. F. Dvornik (*Rev. of Politics*, Oct.).
The Junkers and the Prussian Administration from 1918 to 1939. Lysbeth S. Muncy (*ibid.*).
French Catholics and Communism. Robert Barrat (*Commonweal*, Sept. 26.).
Communism in Italy. Max Ascoli (*ibid.*, Oct. 24).
Over East and West: Recent Efforts of Catholics and Orthodox to Penetrate the Iron Curtain. Helen Iswolsky (*ibid.*, Nov. 28).
Communism in Eastern and Southeastern Europe. Vernon Van Dyke (*Jrn. of Politics*, Aug.).

BRITISH EMPIRE

The Study of Local History. L. C. Hayward (*History*, Sept., 1946).
The Teaching of American History in England. Mary E. Humphreys (*History*, Sept., 1946).
Magna Carta. Sidney Painter (*Amer. Histor. Rev.*, Oct.).

The Knights in the Period of Reform and Rebellion, 1258-67: a Critical Phase in the Rise of a New Class. R. F. Treharne (*Bulletin of the Institute of Histor. Research*, Vol. XXI, No. 62).
Edward I, Builder of Towns. Caroline Shillaber (*Speculum*, July).
Chaucer's Claudian. Robert A. Pratt (*ibid.*).
Military Service and the Development of Nationalism in England, 1272-1327. Barnaby C. Keeney (*Speculum*, Oct.).
The Authorship of the A and B Texts of *Piers Plowman*. Bernard F. Huppé (*ibid.*).
The Papacy and the Diocese of Hereford, 1307-1377. J. T. Driver (*Church Quart. Rev.*, Oct.).
A Hammer of the Wycliffites—William of Rymyngton. Joseph McNulty (*Clergy Rev.*, Sept.).
What is the Scottish Episcopal Church? G. J. MacGillivray (*ibid.*, Oct.).
Cardinal Vaughan as Educator. C. A. Bolton (*ibid.*).
The Recusants of Wales. J. L. Caesar (*ibid.*).
Some Notes on the Conversion of the Welsh People. Henry J. Edwards (*ibid.*, Nov.).
The Church of England Today—A Belgian View. Stephen J. Brown (*ibid.*, Dec.).
The Foreign Element among the English Franciscans. J. R. H. Moorman (*English Histor. Rev.*, July).
English Merchants in Naples and Sicily in the Seventeenth Century. H. Koenigsberger (*ibid.*).
Urquhart, Ponsonby, and Palmerston. Charles Webster (*ibid.*).
Some Early Tavistock Charters. H. P. R. Finberg (*ibid.*).
English Interest in Italy and Italian Romantic Criticism in the 18th century. R. W. Babcock (*Philological Quart.*, Apr.).
A Quaker Aristocrat and Pius VII. H. W. J. Edwards (*Month*, Oct.).
L'Anglicanisme libéral et le mouvement oecuménique. J. V. M. Pollet (*Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa*, July).
Christ and Canterbury, I. Thomas Muldoon (*Australasian Catholic Record*, July).
British Catholics and the Labor Government. Bernard Sullivan (*America*, Oct. 4).
O'Connell, Davis and the Colleges Bill—III. Denis Gwynn (*Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, Sept.).
The Scientific Investigation of the Failure of the Potato Crop in Ireland, 1845-6. T. P. O'Neill (*Irish Histor. Studies*, Sept., 1946).
Historical geography and the Irish Historian. T. W. Freeman (*ibid.*).
Writings on Irish History, 1945 (*ibid.*).
The Black Swan. The Centenary of the Church in West Australia. C. C. Martindale (*Month*, Sept.).
Bishop Challoner and Eighteenth Century Protestantism. C. D. Ford and P. G. Caraman (*ibid.*).

AMERICAN

George Croghan's Journal, 1759-1763. Ed. by Nicholas B. Wainwright (*Pennsylvania Mag. of Hist. and Biog.*, Oct.).
The Mystery of the Horn Papers. Arthur P. Middleton and Douglass Adair (*William and Mary Quart.*, Oct.).
From Munich to Milwaukee by Way of Pennsylvania. Benjamin J. Blied (*American-German Rev.*, Oct.).
The Catholic Church in the United States, 1852-1868: A Survey. Francis J. Tschan (*Records of the Amer. Catholic Histor. Soc.*, Sept.).
Italian Immigration into Philadelphia. Sister M. Agnes Gertrude (*ibid.*).
Sisters of Charity, St. Joseph's Hospital, 1859-1947. Edward A. Mallon (*ibid.*).
Philadelphia and the Revolution. Tr. by Jules A. Baisnée and John J. Meng (*ibid.*).

The Habitant's Standard of Living on the Seigneurie des Mille Isles, 1820-50. W. Stanford Reid (*Canadian Histor. Rev.*, Sept.).

Graduate Theses in Canadian History and Related Subjects. (*ibid.*).

La Chaudière et l'Etchemin. Honorius Provost (*La Revue de l'Université Laval*, Oct.).

From Pensacola to St. Augustine in 1827. A Journey of the Right Reverend Michael Portier. (*Florida Histor. Quart.*, Oct.).

The Double Jurisdiction in French Louisiana (1722-1766). John M. Lenhart (*Franciscan Studies*, Sept.).

Datos para la historia de la economia indiana (Proyecto del banco del monte de piedad de Nueva Orleáns, 1768). Vicente Rodriguez Casado (*Anuario de historia del derecho español*, Vol. XIV).

The Missouri Reader: The Louisiana Purchase, Part I. Ed. by Alice Furtney La Force (*Missouri Histor. Rev.*, Oct.).

Père Joset's Account of the Indian War of 1858. Robert I. Burns (*Pacific Northwest Quart.*, Oct.).

Waiilatpu after the Massacre. Thomas R. Garth (*ibid.*).

Origins of the Episcopal Church in the Pacific Northwest. Thomas E. Jessett (*Oregon Histor. Quart.*, Sept.).

United States Occupation Policies in Japan since Surrender. Hugh Borton (*Political Science Quart.*, June).

The Chapel and Cofradia of Our Lady of Light in Santa Fe. Eleanor B. Adams (*New Mexico Histor. Rev.*, Oct.).

Some Problems of Early Texas Newspapers. James W. Markham (*ibid.*).

Black-Robed Justice in New Mexico, 1846-1912. Arie Poldervaart (*ibid.*).

The Maps of San Francisco Bay and of the Town of Yerba Buena to One Hundred Years Ago. Neal Harlow (*Pacific Histor. Rev.*, Nov.).

British Investments in Latin America. J. Fred Rippy (*Jrn. of Mod. Hist.*, Sept. and Dec.).

Primeros pasos en la evangelización de los indios (1568-76). Francisco Mateos (*Missionalia Hispanica*, Vol. IV, No. 10).

Semblanzas misioneras: P. Pedro Juan Andréu, S. I. Jaime Salva (*ibid.*).

La Merced en el Perú (1534-1584). José Castro Seoane (*ibid.*).

Fray Juan de Gaona y el Colegio de Santiago, en el barrio de Tlaltelolco. Alfonso Zahar Vergara (*Filosofía y letras*, Apr.).

La evolución del derecho penal en Mexico. Francisco Gonzalez de la Vega (*Universidad pontificia bolivariana*, Vol. XIII, No. 48-49).

On the Mexican Book Trade, 1683. Irving A. Leonard (*Hispanic Amer. Histor. Rev.*, Aug.).

The Memorabilia of Agustín de Iturbide. William S. Robertson (*ibid.*).

Glossary of Latin-American Constitutional Terms. Russell H. Fitzgibbon (*ibid.*).

Mexico on the Move. James A. Magner (*Commonweal*, Oct. 31).

The Neo-Inca State (1537-1572). George Kubler (*Hispanic Amer. Histor. Rev.*, May).

United States Aid to the Chilean Wars of Independence. William L. Neumann (*ibid.*).

The Immigration Movement of the Intervention and Empire as Seen Through the Mexican Press. Alfred J. Hanna and Kathryn Abbey Hanna (*ibid.*).

Attitudes of Foreign Governments towards the Spanish Reoccupation of the Dominican Republic. Charles C. Hauch (*ibid.*).

Three Master Architects in New Spain. Heinrich Berlin (*ibid.*).

Christlicher Brauch and kirchliche Kunst in Peru um 1600 (mit 8 Abb.). P. L. Kilger (*Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft* [*Nouvelle Revue de science missionnaire*] Vol. III, Fasc. 4).

Subsídios para a história da Ordem III de S. Francisca em Minas. Samuel Tetteroo (*Revista eclesiástica brasileira*, June and Sept.).

BOOKS RECEIVED

Bannon, John Francis, and Peter Masten Dunne, *Latin America: An Historical Survey.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1947. Pp. x, 944. $6.50.)

Baron, Salo Wittmayer, *Modern Nationalism and Religion.* (New York: Harper and Bros. 1947. Pp. x, 363. $5.00.)

Benedictine Monks of St. Augustine's Abbey, Ramsgate, *The Book of Saints. A Dictionary of Servants of God Canonized by the Catholic Church.* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1947. Pp. xviii, 708. $6.00.) This extremely handy and helpful volume of thumbnail sketches on the saints now appears in a fourth edition, completely rewritten and greatly enlarged from the original edition of 1921. Each sketch carries an abbreviated bibliography which will lead the student to further sources. Everyone interested in hagiography will welcome this new edition of the valuable volume by the monks of St. Augustine's Abbey, Ramsgate.

Brace, Richard Munthe, *Bordeaux and the Gironde, 1789-1794.* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 1947. Pp. xi, 279. $3.00.)

Brown, David Tucker, Jr., *Marine from Virginia.* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1947. Pp. 105. $2.50.) This attractive little volume contains the letters of David Tucker Brown, Jr., a member of the United States Marine Corps Reserve, who was killed in action on Okinawa, Shima Ryukyu Islands on May 14, 1945. They are addressed to his mother and extend in time from July 17, 1941, to March 31, 1945. There are also a few extracts from letters of other marines and addenda giving biographical sketches of some of the persons mentioned in the correspondence.

Cole, Allan B. (Editor), *Yankee Surveyors in the Shogun's Seas.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1947. Pp. 161. $2.50.) Mr. Cole here edits the records of the United States Surveying Expedition to the North Pacific Ocean in the years 1853-1856.

Collier, John, *The Indians of the Americas.* (New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc. 1947. Pp. xi, 326. $3.75.)

Coulter, E. Merton, *The South During Reconstruction, 1865-1877.* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 947. Pp. xii, 426. $5.00.)

D'Arcy, William, O.F.M.Conv., *The Fenian Movement in the United States, 1858-1886.* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press. 1947. Pp. xii, 453. $4.00.) This doctoral dissertation of Father D'Arcy makes good use of hitherto unpublished archival material of both the United States and Canada, to throw further light on one of the most interesting and controversial aspects of American-Irish history.

Duratschek, Sister Mary Claudia, *Crusading along Sioux Trails: A History of the Catholic Indian Missions of South Dakota.* (St. Meinrad, Indiana: The Grail. 1947. Pp. xiii, 334. $4.00.)

Elsensohn, Sister M. Alfreda, *Pioneer Days in Idaho County,* Vol. I. (Caldwell, Idaho: Caxton Printers, Ltd. 1947. Pp. xx, 527. $7.50.)

European Recovery and American Aid: A Report by the President's Committee on Foreign Aid. (Washington: United States Government Printing Office. 1947. Pp. x, 286. $.60.)

Ferguson, Wallace K., and Geoffrey Bruun, *A Survey of European Civilization.* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1947. Pp. xxv, 989, xcv. $6.50.) This is the second edition of a widely used textbook which appeared first in 1936. It has been brought up to date in all particulars and the second edition is edited by William L. Langer of Harvard.

Finn, William J., *Sharps and Flats in Five Decades.* (New York: Harper and Bros. 1947. Pp. x, 342. $3.75.)

Footman, David, *Ferdinand Lassalle: Romantic Revolutionary.* (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1947. Pp. xx, 251. $3.50.)

Fowler, George Bingham, *Intellectual Interests of Engelbert of Admont.* (New York: Columbia University Press. 1947. Pp. 251. $3.00.)

Franklin, John Hope, *From Slavery to Freedom: A History of American Negroes.* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. 1947. Pp. xv, 622. $5.00.)

Gannett, Henry, *American Names: A Guide to the Origin of Place Names in the United States.* (Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Press. 1947. Pp. 334. $3.75.)

Giordani, Igino, *Mary of Nazareth. A True Portrait.* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1947. Pp. xix, 185. $2.75.) A life of the Blessed Virgin translated from the original Italian by Mothers Clelia Maranzana and Mary Paula Williamson of the Cenacle.

Goodman, Abram Vossen, *American Overture: Jewish Rights in Colonial Times.* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America. 1947. Pp. xiv, 265. $3.00.)

Goodrich, Leland M., and Marie J. Carroll (Editors), *Documents on American Foreign Relations,* Vol. VII, *July 1944-June 1945.* (Princeton: Published for the World Peace Foundation by the Princeton University Press. 1947. Pp. xxxvii, 961. $6.00.)

Graham, Dom Aelred, *The Christ of Catholicism. A Meditative Study.* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1947. Pp. xii, 381. $4.00.) This work by a monk of Ampleforth Abbey is both a life of Christ and more. Its sub-title gives one a clue to its contents. In addition to the seven chapters of text there is an appendix of sources and bibliography with a three-way index of biblical passages, persons, places, authors, and non-biblical names.

Hall, Walter Phelps, and William Stearns Davis, *The Course of Europe Since Waterloo.* Second edition. (New York: D. Appleton-Century Co. 1947. Pp. xviii, 1060, xxii. $5.00.) This is the second edition of the Hall-Davis textbook which first appeared in 1926 under the title of *Europe Since Waterloo* by the late Professor Davis of the University of Minnesota. Professor Hall of Princeton drew upon this earlier work to publish the volume under the present title in 1941. The publisher has now brought out a new edition of the text which carries the narrative down to the operation of the United Nations in the post-war world of our day. The volume is one of the Century Historical Series edited by William E. Lingelbach of the University of Pennsylvania.

Hanus, Franciscus, *Die aeltere Geschichte der Zisterzienser. Abtei Leubus in Schlesien bis zur Mitte des 14. Jahrhunderts.* (Breslau: Breslau University Press. Pp. xii, 205. $4.00.)

Harrold, Charles Frederick (Editor), *New Edition of the Works of John Henry Newman: Apologia pro vita sua; The Idea of a University; A Grammar of Assent.* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1947. Pp. xxii, 400; xxxviii, 413; xxii, 394. $10.50.)

História da civilização antiga e medieval. (São Paulo, Brazil: Faculdade de Filosofia, Ciências e Letras. Universidade de S. Paulo. 1946. Pp. 362.)

Holbrook, Stewart H., *The Story of American Railroads.* (New York: Crown Publishers. 1947. Pp. x, 468. $4.50.)

Houck, Frederick A., *Man's Triumph: with God in Christ.* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co. 1947. Pp. xii, 244. $2.00.) The fourth revised edition of a volume originally published in 1938.

Jones, Charles W., *Saints' Lives and Chronicles in Early England.* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 1947. Pp. xiii, 232. $3.00.)

Kroeber, A. L., *Configurations of Culture Growth.* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. 1944. Pp. x, 882. $7.50.)

Kuhn, Anne L., *The Mother's Role in Childhood Education: New England Concepts, 1830-1860.* (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1947. Pp. x, 224. $3.00.)

Lebreton, Dagmar Renshaw, *Chahta-Ima: The Life of Adrien-Emmanuel Rouquette.* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1947. Pp. xix, 442. $4.00.)

Lehmann, Karl, *Thomas Jefferson: American Humanist.* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1947. Pp. xiii, 273. $4.50.)

Lucas, Henry S., *1847—Ebenezer—1947. Memorial Souvenir of the Centennial Commemoration of Dutch Immigration to the United States Held in Holland, Michigan, 13-16 August 1947.* (New York: Netherlands Information Bureau. 1947. Pp. 40.)

Malin, James C., *The Grassland of North America. Prolegomena to Its History.* (Lawrence, Kansas: The Author, 1541 University Drive. 1947. Pp. vii, 398. $3.00.) Professor Malin of the University of Kansas here examines in twenty-one chapters the varied aspects lying behind the great area of the central United States designated as the Grassland. The volume carries a bibliography of both literature and maps and an appendix of Grassland map studies.

Marcus, Jacob R., *Communal Sick-Care in the German Ghetto.* (Cincinnati: Union of American Hebrew Congregations. 1947. Pp. xiii, 335. $4.00.)

Maynard, Theodore, *Humanist as Hero: The Life of Sir Thomas More.* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1947. Pp. xiii, 261. $3.00.)

McCaleb, Walter F., *The Conquest of the West.* (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1947. Pp. xiv, 336. $3.75.)

McInnis, Edgar, *Canada: A Political and Social History.* (New York: Rinehart and Co., Inc. 1947. Pp. xv, 574. $5.00.)

McLean, Joseph E., *William Rufus Day: Supreme Court Justice from Ohio.* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1946. Pp. 172. $2.00.)

Mélanges Auguste Pelzer: Études d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale de la scolastique médiévale offertes à Monseigneur Auguste Pelzer à l'occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire. (Louvain: Bibliothèque de l'Université, Bureaux de "Recueil". 1947. Pp. xix, 662.)

Monaghan, Frank (Editor), *Heritage of Freedom. The History and Significance of the Basic Documents of American Liberty.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1947. Pp. 150. $3.50.)

Moreau, E. de, S.J., *Histoire de l'Église en Belgique.* 2 Vols. (Bruxelles: L'Édition Universelle. 1947. Pp. xvii, 388; 501. 520 frs. belges.)

Mott, Frank Luther, *Golden Multitudes: The Story of Best Sellers in the United States.* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1947. Pp. xii, 357. $5.00.)

Murchie, Guy, *Saint Croix: The Sentinel River.* (New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce. 1947. Pp. xx, 281. $3.50.)

O'Connell, Charles C., *Light Over Fatima.* (Cork: Mercier Press Ltd. 1947. Pp. 163.) A novel based on the appearance of our Lady at Fatima in 1917.

Orcibal, Jean, *Jean Duvergier de Hauranne, Abbé de Saint-Cyran et son temps, 1581-1638.* (Louvain: Bureaux de la Revue, Bibliothèque de l'Université. 1947. Pp. xv, 685.)

Parkes, Henry Bamford, *The American Experience: An Interpretation of the History and Civilization of the American People.* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. 1947. Pp. xiv, 343. $3.50.)

Peckham, Howard H., *Pontiac and the Indian Uprising.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1947. Pp. xviii, 346. $4.50.)

Pollard, James E., *The President and the Press.* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1947. Pp. xiii, 866. $5.00.)

Prado, R. P. J., *Praelectionum Biblicarum Compendium II. Vetus Testamentum, Liber Primus: de sacra veteris Testamenti historia.* (Madrid: Edit. El Perpetuo Socorro. 1947. Pp. xxxii, 655.)

Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society at the Semi-Annual Meeting held in Boston, April 17, 1946. (Worcester, Massachusetts: American Antiquarian Society. 1947. Pp. 153.)

Roeder, Ralph, *Juarez and his Mexico.* 2 Vols. (New York: Viking Press. 1947. Pp. 380; 383-763. $10.00.)

Schargo, Nelly Noémie, *History in the Encyclopédie.* (New York: Columbia University Press. 1947. Pp. 251. $3.00.)

Schevill, Ferdinand, *The Great Elector.* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1947. Pp. ix, 442. $5.00.)

Schimberg, Albert Paul, *The Story of Therese Neumann.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1947. Pp. ix, 232. $2.50.)

Seaman, L. C. B., *A Short Social History of England.* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1947. Pp. 96. $.50.)

Sedgwick, Henry Dwight, *Horace. A Biography.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1947. Pp. 182. $3.00.)

Simkins, Francis Butler, *The South Old and New: A History, 1820-1947.* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. 1947. Pp. xvi, 527. $6.00.)

Simon, Yves R., *Community of the Free.* (New York: Henry Holt and Co. 1947. Pp. xi, 172. $3.00.)

Slick, Sewell Elias, *William Trent and the West.* (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Archives Publishing Co. 1947. Pp. vii, 188. $3.50.)

Soloveytchik, George, *Potemkin: Soldier, Statesman, Lover and Consort of Catherine of Russia.* (New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc. 1947. Pp. xiv, 346. $3.50.)

Sparn, Enrique, *La Riqueza de las bibliotecas pertenecientes a la Iglesia cristiana en códices.* (Córdoba, Argentina: Imprenta de la Universidad. 1946. Pp. 75.)

———, *La Riqueza de las bibliotecas pertenecientes a la iglesia cristiana en incunables.* (Córdoba, Argentina: Imprenta de la Universidad. 1947. Pp. 38.)

———, *La Riqueza de las iglesias cristianas en bibliotecas al sobrevenir la Segunda Guerra Mundial.* (Córdoba, Argentina: Academia Nacional de Ciencias. 1945; 1946. Pp. 136; 69.)

Suelzer, Sister Mary Joseph (Translator), *Julianus Pomerius: The Contemplative Life.* (Westminster, Maryland: Newman Bookshop. 1947. Pp. 220. $2.50.)

Suess, Adolph B., *The Romantic Story of Cahokia, Illinois.* (Belleville, Illinois: Buechler Publishing Co. 1947. Pp. 119. Cloth $2.50; paper $1.50.) The second edition of a work which first appeared in 1943 on the old French town in southern Illinois.

Thompson, Robert Luther, *Wiring a Continent: The History of the Telegraph Industry in the United States, 1832-1866.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1947. Pp. xviii, 544. $7.50.)

Tschopik, Harry, Jr., *Highland Communities of Central Peru: A Regional Survey.* (Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Office. 1947. Pp. viii, 56. $.50.)

Tully, Andrew, *Era of Elegance.* (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co. 1947. Pp. xii, 232. $3.00.)

Vergne, Yvonne de la, *Madame Elisabeth of France.* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co. 1947. Pp. xiii, 416. $4.00.)

Vernon, Ida Stevenson Weldon, *Pedro de Valdivia, Conquistador of Chile.* (Austin: University of Texas Press. 1946. Pp. 193.)

Wade, Mason (Editor), *The Journals of Francis Parkman.* 2 Vols. (New York: Harper and Bros. 1947. Pp. xxv, 281; vii, 385-718. $10.00.)

Walsh, James E., M.M., *Maryknoll Spiritual Directory.* (New York: Field Afar Press. 1947. Pp. ix, 277. $2.00.) Bishop Walsh, former superior general of Maryknoll, has in fifteen chapters discussed the rule, daily life, mission vocation, and general spirit which animates the Maryknoll men. An appendix to the volume includes seven pertinent papal documents on the priestly vocation, seminary training, and the Catholic missions.

Weldon, T. D., *States and Morals: A Study in Political Conflicts.* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. 1947. Pp. xi, 301. $3.00.)

Wiskemann, Elizabeth, *Italy.* (New York: Oxford University Press. 1947. Pp. viii, 160. $1.75.) This brief survey of Italian history in the twentieth century is another in the series, The World To-Day. It is illustrated and has an index. Readers of the REVIEW will find the chapter on "Church, State, and Education in Italy" of interest.

Wright, Louis B., *The Atlantic Frontier: Colonial American Civilization, 1607-1763.* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1947. Pp. xi, 354. $4.50.)

Yeager, Sister M. Hildegarde, C.S.C., *The Life of James Roosevelt Bayley, First Bishop of Newark and Eighth Archbishop of Baltimore, 1814-1877.* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press. 1947. Pp. xi, 512. $4.50.) This definitive life of a convert bishop of Newark and Baltimore is Volume XXXVI of the Studies in American Church History of the Catholic University of America. Sister Hildegarde, professor of history in Dunbarton College, Washington, has done her work with admirable thoroughness, and the original manuscript material of the archives of Baltimore, Newark, New York, Rochester, and Notre Dame have yielded an abundance of data on Bayley which likewise sheds many interesting sidelights on general movements in American Catholicism in the period of the mid-nineteenth century. A thorough index adds greatly to the usefulness of this substantial volume for students of the American Church.

For the first time in English

THE COMING OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

By GEORGE LeFEBVRE

Professor Emeritus of the History of the French Revolution, University of Paris.

Translated by R.R. Palmer

AN excellent picture of France at the end of the Old Regime and during the first year of the Revolution. The author demonstrates the nature and problems of the Revolutionary struggles as a whole; then critically examines and reasonably reconciles many diverse interpretations of the years covered.

Just published, $3.00

At your bookstore

PRINCETON University Press

Princeton, N.J.